



## Seattle Light Rail Review Panel

**Julie Bassuk**  
Design Commission, LRRP Co-Chair

**David Cutler**  
Planning Commission, LRRP Co-Chair

**Catherine Benotto**  
Planning Commission

**Dan Corson**  
Public Art Advisory Committee

**Mary Fialko**  
Design Commission

**Shannon Loew**  
Design Commission

**Kurt Kiefer**  
Public Art Advisory Committee

**Laurel Kunkler**  
Design Commission

**Kevin McDonald**  
Planning Commission

**Tom Nelson**  
Design Commission

**Julie Parrett**  
Design Commission/  
Public Art Advisory Committee

**Osama Quotah**  
Design Commission

**Norie Sato**  
Design Commission/  
Public Art Advisory Committee

**Donald Vehige**  
Design Commission

**Debbie Wick-Harris**  
Design Commission

**Valerie Kinast**  
Coordinator

**Tom Iurino**  
Senior staff

**April 5, 2012**

Convened 8:00 am  
Adjourned 12:00 pm

### Project Reviewed

Roosevelt Station Light Rail Review Panel

### Panel Members Present

Julie Bassuk, Chair  
David Cutler  
Mary Fialko  
Julie Parrett  
Shannon Loew  
Kurt Kiefer  
Tom Nelson  
Kevin McDonald  
Debbie Wick-Harris

### Excused Panel Members

Osama Quotah  
Norie Sato  
Catherine Benotto  
Pablo Schuquirensky  
Don Vehige  
Laurel Kunkler  
Dan Corson

### Staff Present

Valerie Kinast  
Tom Iurino

---

**April 5, 2012**

**Project: Roosevelt Station Light Rail Review Panel**

**Phase:** 60% Design  
**Last Reviewed:** May 19, 2011  
**Presenters:** Kristin Hoffman, Sound Transit  
David Hewitt, Hewitt  
Barbara Swift, Swift Company  
Barbara Luecke, Sound Transit  
Luca Buvoli, Luca Buvoli Studio  
Roberto Behar, R and R Studios  
Rosario Marquardt, R and R Studios

**Attendees:** Bob Nichols, Sound Transit  
Caitlin Evan, Swift Company  
Ellen Blair, Sound Transit  
Erik Finley, Sound Transit  
George Hanna, Hewitt  
Jennifer Cohee, Hewitt  
John Hoffman, John Hoffman Planning and Design  
Jon O'Hare, Sound Transit  
Mylinda Sneed, Sound Transit  
Ruri Yampolsky, Arts and Cultural Affairs  
Shane Dewald, SDOT

**Time: 8:30am – 12:00pm**

---

### **Recusal**

Panel member Quotah recused himself because his firm is working with Sound Transit on the light rail station at Brooklyn.

### **Disclosures**

Panel member McDonald assisted with traffic analysis around light rail station.

Panel member Cutler's firm GGLO is working on a project 3 blocks to the east of the light rail station.

### **Presentation**

Sound Transit and its design team presented the 60% design for the Roosevelt Light Rail Station at NE 65<sup>th</sup> St and 12<sup>th</sup> Ave NE. The station, part of the 4.3 mile North Link extension, will be built by 2021 and will board 8,000 people per day by 2030. It is comprised of two entrance buildings on the west side of 12<sup>th</sup> Ave NE; the north entrance is at NE 67<sup>th</sup> St., the south entrance is at NE 65<sup>th</sup> St., and a drop-off zone lies on NE 66<sup>th</sup> St. between the two entrance buildings.

Since the last review, the design team refined the building and landscape design and added artists to develop artwork concepts. Specifically, the team presented its major changes and updates: the inclusion of the green street principles to guide the design of NE 66<sup>th</sup> St. which the city recently designated as a green street; the elimination of parking on the west side of 12<sup>th</sup> Ave NE freeing up space for an expanded, curved sidewalk and larger planting area; condensed and shortened the lobbies of the north and south station buildings thereby increasing the size of the plaza on both sides of NE 66<sup>th</sup> St.; the refinement of the sidewalk grades at NE 65<sup>th</sup> St. and 12<sup>th</sup> Ave NE to enable a corner entry to the south entry building; the design of a covered waiting and bike storage area on the

north side of NE 66<sup>th</sup> St.; the refinement of the form of the vents; the use of five foot pilasters and a wide structural “box” to provide enough space to separate and sculpt the elevators, escalators and stairs to the platform; the use of a creamy yellow color both outside and on select walls inside the station; the creation of layered, artwork on the interior walls of the station reflecting mobility; and the creation of landmark artwork to identify the exterior plaza on NE 66<sup>th</sup> St.

### **ACTION (by Loew)**

The Light Rail Review Panel thanked Sound Transit and its design team for its presentation of the 60% design of the Roosevelt Light Rail Station. The panel appreciated the thorough presentation, the numerous technical requirements and constraints, the addition of the artists to the team and integration of their work into the design, and the overbuild analysis. By a vote of 6-2, the panel approved the design, with the following comments:

#### **Public realm**

- Integrate the open space on NE 66<sup>th</sup> St. into the green street design. Develop the design, as well as the art, to activate this space; for example, consider providing direct access to south entry building and adjusting the footprint of the station to change the orientation of TOD parcel A and thus increase its street frontage on NE 66<sup>th</sup> St.. Encourage private development on Sound Transit parcels elsewhere on NE 66<sup>th</sup> St. to similarly activate the street and plaza (through Sound Transit RFQ/P requirements and by updating City development standards). Also, ensure the design enables a good connection to the TOD sites; don't let the bike storage impair access.
- Consider undergrounding of electrical utilities on NE 65<sup>th</sup> St., NE 66<sup>th</sup> St. and 12<sup>th</sup> Ave NE. This is a missed opportunity. It is especially important given that these intersections are at the heart of an emerging neighborhood, which was recently rezoned to permit more density in the surrounding blocks.
- Study and refine the design of the egress at southern end of the south entry. Provide more room to improve circulation to and from the west, and to expose more of the east façade of the Dwell building.
- Add curb bulbs and a crosswalk at the intersection of 12th Ave NE and NE 66<sup>th</sup> St.; they will aid access to the open space between the north and south station entries and reinforce the notion of NE 66<sup>th</sup> St. as a green street.
- Develop a roof plan and study how the roof could help with meeting the green factor requirement. The roof is a fifth façade that will be seen by people in the surrounding buildings.
- Identify and study the pedestrian desire lines and make sure the design of the open space takes them into account.
- Develop a lighting plan, including lighting for safety and security.

#### **Exterior architecture**

- Resolve the design of the details, such as the joints and transitions between materials. The execution of the design concept's minimal modern aesthetic relies upon the successful resolution of these details.
- Further study and refine the geometry, articulation and finish of the vents and how they fit into overall aesthetic.

#### **Interior**

- Further explore the intended effect color has on the interior spaces at all levels of the station. Study the colors proposed, how color is used, and how the light quality and materials affect the perception of color.
- Further refine the design of the platform level; it feels cluttered.

- Further study how the walls continue from the exterior, puncture the form, and terminate in the interior.

#### Artwork

- Be bolder with the interior art work. Watch the budget; develop the art work and priorities for it to ensure that the vision is carried out as planned.
- Integrate the exterior art work into the building or site. Use the art work, in conjunction with the design of the plaza, to create a place. Consider using similar paving materials across the street. Coordinate not just with the design team, but also SDOT.
- Return for another review of the artwork before the 90% review.

#### Sustainability

- Better explain the design's sustainability strategy. Consider going beyond the Sound Transit's adopted checklist. For example, durability is just one facet of sustainability in materials; consider the full lifecycle of the material, from production to disposition.
- Explore better use of natural air ventilation.

#### Overbuild

- Suggest the Sound Transit Board reassess its station overbuild policy to ensure opportunities for placemaking and increased ridership are given more weight relative to the cost benefit analysis.

Panel member Parrett voted no because too many issues were unaddressed. She believed significant changes were required to the design.

Panel member Wick-Harris voted no because NE 66th Street, as designed, did not appear to be an active space that had the potential to engage TOD projects to the west or encourage pedestrian activity. Also, she believed the exterior site design did not appear to be at a 60% level (too many outstanding items) and the development of green stormwater infrastructure was neither sufficient nor adequately addressed.

### Panel Members' Questions and Comments

*Thanks for the great presentation. Could you talk more about the covered waiting area on NE 66<sup>th</sup> St.? Does it cover the ROW?*

It doesn't cover the ROW; it comes out to the sidewalk edge. On the north side of street, it is integrated with the bike facility. On the south side of street, it is attached to the wall.

*Did you explore placing underground the overhead power lines? This is an emerging neighborhood and we should take advantage of the construction to set a high standard of design and execution in our urban villages. We need to set the standard for other development to follow.*

We studied the electrical lines on 12<sup>th</sup> Ave NE. At the end of construction, the overhead wires will be located back in the west side of 12<sup>th</sup> because that is what Seattle City Light prefers. There is a large cost to bury the wires. We did not study NE 65<sup>th</sup> St.

*Why did you choose graphic and low dimensional work and not 3D work? Did you consider occupying space, perhaps suspended work?*

We didn't suspend the art work because it didn't relate to the architecture; we felt that the space was articulated sufficiently that the art form could be simplified. We also didn't opt for suspended art work at the waiting level because of concerns for maintenance. We've met with fabricators and we plan to use coated metal panels. They are not flat drawings, but a series of surfaces. We may protrude the elements more than we've shown.

*Will we see the art work more than once?*

Yes, at review of the 90% design.

*What are priorities for artwork? What possibility is there that you might not realize it all?*

The priorities depend on several factors: feasibility, the panel's comments, and the constraints of the project i.e., areas in touch zone, etc. Ideally, we plan to make and install the whole thing. We would place priority on the lobbies and platform. The budget for the interior artwork is 200K and for the exterior it is 300K.

*Please supply more info re: color and materials and patterns nearby. We need to judge the project's materials to see if the detailed artwork will work in large spaces.*

Yes, we'll supply.

*You said you're not quite able to meet ADA. What is missing?*

The sidewalk is generally at the same grade as the street and complies with ADA requirements to the maximum extent feasible according to the design guidance provided by the City of Seattle. The topography of the site makes it difficult to remain under the ADA 5% maximum slope. There is ADA access into all the entries.

*Is there a potential conflict with the interaction between the green street and drop off zone?*

The green street is a fresh idea and is still evolving. By embracing the green street in this project, we are setting the table for development of the street as it moves to west and east. The drop off zone is a 3 minute zone and is not a high traffic area. The green street shifts the focus from supporting vehicles to graceful co-habitation of street. The drop off function is not in conflict with the green street concept. For example, Cedar Street and Vine Streets in downtown are green streets. They are distinguished by the treatment of paving, planting, and facades.

*Along 65<sup>th</sup>, what is the element that matches the retail edge? Why not bring the building forward?*

It is an exit corridor and the lower element relates to the adjacent Dwell canopy. There is no retail in the station. The station is set back a few feet from the retail edge consistent with SDOT requirements.

*What are the strategies for handling stormwater? Will the sidewalk be pervious?*

The water from the sidewalk flows into the planters on 12<sup>th</sup> Ave NE. Rain gardens, with underdrains due to the surrounding impervious soils, were proposed in our SIP process, but were rejected by SPU.

*What was the rationale for the curvilinear treatment of the urban edge, besides the grade?*

The strip used to be parking. There is a significant duct bank in this area and with a conventional configuration, the street trees would have been on top of the duct bank which isn't the best for trees. The curves allow good sized trees. We've treated the blocks from NE 65<sup>th</sup> St to NE 67<sup>th</sup> St the same way so it will read as one unit.

*Can you show how the color and materials move from the outside to the inside? Where does this happen? You mentioned this as a feature, and it could be stronger.*

The wall material is highly finished and light colored and will match well, inside or outside. The wall needs more definitive termination. Not all the walls are in the same plane which may not be clear in the rendering.

*I find the issues of urban design are more problematic now than they were at 30% design. You are putting a lot of energy into the public space at NE 66<sup>th</sup> St. and 12<sup>th</sup> Ave NE. You are making a lot of moves to make an urban space, adding an art piece, for example to punctuate the space. Yet, there is no way to access the building and no weather protection. You're fighting yourselves. We predict most people will be coming from the south or north and won't even see this area. The reality is that this will be a dead zone. The activity will be at the entries, not here. It's not the entrance. People will drop off at 12<sup>th</sup> and 65<sup>th</sup>. Now that you've removed parking on 12<sup>th</sup> Ave NE, did you consider putting the drop off there? I think you need a corridor to gain access to building.*

NE 66<sup>th</sup> St. is the only street that works well for the drop off. Directly in front of the station on NE 65<sup>th</sup> St is the proposed bus zone which would not be compatible with a drop-off area. NE 67<sup>th</sup> St is a narrow residential street that cannot accommodate parking on both sides. We looked at locating the drop off on 12<sup>th</sup> Ave NE, but this would result in passengers exiting into the travel lane. Many people could use NE 66<sup>th</sup> St. to get to the station and the bike area will activate the space. We looked at covered walks and have provided covered waiting areas. With the recent rezoning passed by council, this will become a denser place and it will be delightful as it will be relatively quiet. This also supports the community plan for more open space. We looked at a south entry to the north entry building, however Sound Transit prefers to permit people to move in an open environment rather than confined to a corridor. This is consistent with the fact that people walk in the outdoor elements.

*What other structural strategies were discussed? What is the finish of the concrete?*

We did study other structural strategies but liked the pilasters. We anticipate a raw concrete finish with no color or treatment. It sets up a foil for the other finishes and materials.

*Please give me a quick overview of the samples and materials.*

For the exterior, we're exploring metal panel for the vents, yellow colored glazed porcelain steel panels and polished CMU for the building walls, and aluminum grill for bike cages. For the interior, we're looking at blue green wall tile, metal ceiling tiles, mesh guardrails, porcelain enamel end walls, and Sound Transit standard floor tile.

*Could you describe the design of the form of the vent? Why the change in scale?*

The vents are pure and straightforwardly expressed. They have grown especially at the north entry which is adjacent to an area of buildings with lower heights. We've studied the vents a lot to minimize their size and scale; canting the vents gives them more refinement and it works well with the Dwell building to the west. The required air flow is the driver of the size of the vents. It is not the most perfect form and we will continue to refine them and reduce them in scale if possible.

*Can you redistribute the vent's square footage?*

The quick answer is no. By shifting the vent location, you tend to increase the size of other elements. The more you move it around, the bigger things get.

*What is air quality of air coming out?*

Air quality out of the vents is not an issue. There are no odors and the vents are primarily for smoke evacuation in an emergency, such as a fire.

*I applaud the thinking and humor of the exterior artwork, but it's hard to use humor well if you are not a member of a particular community – what one community might find humorous another might find offensive. I urge you to spend time here. For example, the high school thinks of itself as a serious place. We also need more information on the quality of the materials you propose, especially because simple forms may degrade quickly when exposed to rain.*

*What are the sustainable strategies for the project? What are your energy and water goals?*

Sound Transit has a sustainability policy and a checklist of practices to follow. With this station, our primary strategy involves daylighting and harvesting rainwater for irrigation; harvesting rainwater for cleaning purposes is not being done because it's not feasible. We only have a staff toilet and only heat and cool spaces that are used by staff. We do not heat or cool platform spaces. Our materials are durable including concrete, steel and glass.

*The pedestrian ramp on NE 65<sup>th</sup> St. is five feet, which seems narrow. Could it be wider?*

The ramp could be wider with a corresponding loss of green factor. We are just under the Green Factor requirement on the south entry parcel.

*What is the brown bar at NE 65<sup>th</sup> St. and 12<sup>th</sup> Ave NE. Why is it there?*

They are low walls used for seating; we used them to grapple with grade change and access to station. This is the result of trying to get an entry on the corner.

*What's happening with lighting at 66<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup>?*

The bike canopy has skylights and is also illuminated. There is lighting in the plaza. We've not designed this yet and it will be influenced by the plans for the exterior artwork.

*Could you briefly describe the planting areas, turf and plants, height, material for site walls along 12<sup>th</sup> Ave NE?*

Basically, if it's not a tree, the planting material is knee height or lower. We intend a clean plane you can see through. We plan to use highly textural materials, such as low dogwood, ferns, etc. The wall will be concrete in conjunction with the building and its coloring.

*Why not create a bump out intersection at NE 66<sup>th</sup> St. like there is at NE 67<sup>th</sup> St.?*

We want to encourage crossing at NE 67<sup>th</sup> St. SDOT does not want the cross walk at NE 66<sup>th</sup> St..

*What is SDOT's timing for creating a green street?*

DPD staff went to a Roosevelt Neighborhood Association (RNA) meeting last week and produced a schedule. The RNA will supply neighborhood committee members. Other committee members will include City staff

and a Sound Transit representative. DPD hopes to have a concept by this fall. This will be in time for our 90% design to address.

*Wayfinding?*

We are using standard Sound Transit signs and maps within the station. For example, there is a sign at every entry, per the signage program.

*(public realm)*

*There is great complexity for the exiting sequence, lots of pressure, tightness and things happening. Are we in a retail area? Perhaps you could move that exit to the south onto the street, which would free up more space for the ramp, and expose more of the Dwell building. The ramp needs to be not just for ADA, but it needs to make the station more permeable. Bikes may use ramp too.*

*How well will the landscape swath fare at the corner? Flip the wall and landscape.*

*Provide a pedestrian bump out, with ramps, at NE 66<sup>th</sup> St. and 12<sup>th</sup> Ave NE.*

*Let's make the community open space easy to access. How to integrate it over both sides of the street? We also need the space to be activated and to feel comfortable. It should not just be a back of the house area. It should be considered as part of the TOD development and the green street concept; we should require both of them to respond. We need to program NE 66<sup>th</sup> St. so it is active.*

*What is TOD opportunity of small parcel? In this condition, does it make sense to make the station bigger? Or reorient N-S to E-W? Look at using that space to solve the problems. Consider shifting the TOD parcel.*

*Look at where the bike storage and TOD intersect, and make sure the relationship creates a good space.*

*I appreciated R&R's drawing with continuous paving across 66<sup>th</sup>. Let's have zero curb, and make it a place.*

*Think through the materials. The artists need to think of that too. I commend the thought process to date. I am excited to see the iterations of the art pieces.*

*The small seat walls on south side of the north station entry building present an obstacle. Make sure the pedestrian desire lines are clear. Non standard treatment of sidewalk needs to be clear for visually impaired.*

*(exterior architecture)*

*Don't see correlation between pure minimal form of exterior, and interior. Pay attention to resolution of all the intersections of the forms so you can read it as a whole.*

*The vents are obviously challenging. I think you've got to love the vents. They're so big they're their own thing. They are architecture now, with their own identity, but same vocabulary. Get around the free area problem, let the vents go straight up and let water in and drain it. That approach would shrink the size of the vent.*

*I liked the study of keeping the vent within the staircase.*

*Consider the fifth façade, the roofplane. Explore what it looks like from above. Resolution of that is very important.*

*(interior spaces)*

*I like the Standard sign at ticketing.*

*Further investigate the colors to use. The design sees very hermetic. There are warm colors on the exterior; the interior could benefit from that.*

*Work with Sound Transit's materials as you develop the artwork. Also, think where to spend the energy on artwork, the procession, and lastly the spaces on platform.*

*(platform level)*

*Don't quite see how the spaces are better. It needs to be integrated. I am excited by concept but not the execution.*

*The rendering looks busy. Try to aim for uniformity; explore how to mute the background and make the stair stand out and the use of warm, tactile materials to mitigate the sense of subterraneanness. At roofplane and wall plane, the muscularity in design is OK.*

*(art)*

*The interior of the station warrants a larger gesture. What you've designed will get lost. You need to address space in a larger and more holistic way. Consider flows and connectivity.*

*Where are we focusing the effort on the interior? That is the question.*

*The interior space needs something that is more grabbing. Illustrate the multiple mobility modes. Maybe explore where these sequences start and stop and weave together with the station as the mixing point.*

*The schemes are safe and retro, but I like the integration into the architecture. Huge warning about integration across materials; watch for value engineering.*

*I like the progression of the artwork.*

*You should work in plaza area at NE 66<sup>th</sup> St. and 12<sup>th</sup> Ave NE and not at NE 65<sup>th</sup> St. and 12<sup>th</sup> Ave NE. Talk to the community to make sure your assumptions are reasonable.*

*Show the refined artwork before 90% review.*

*I am excited the artists have been brought on board, and that they're collaborating.*

*Look at color studies, as there are different implications for grey days.*

*The exterior artwork feels safe. I am seeing images of just an object, that is not integrated. Work more with Hewitt to integrate it into the building, perhaps the back-of-house portion of the building.*

*I appreciate the fun the artists have with the exterior artwork. I like the "I Love You" concept. Embrace the simplicity of that message.*

*I like the intersection concept related to mobility more than the building blocks.*

*Go back to the drawing board and work with Hewitt. Don't restrict yourselves to what you've shown.*

*(sustainability)*

*Sound Transit is doing a great service for our carbon load. Even though the building is passively conditioned, we can push them to do more. For the material selection, consider the lifecycle as well as durability. I want to see more at 90%, and to see more the match of true need and strategy.*

*(overbuilding)*

*Thanks for rationale for overbuilding. We need to encourage the city and Sound Transit to develop a more refined policy for TOD, so that it is not piecemeal and to better integrate the TOD and stations into the urban context. We suggest Sound Transit board to expand its policy when it makes sense, so that it is not just a cost benefit decision. Give greater weight to placemaking and ridership.*