



**Seattle  
Design  
Commission**

**APPROVED**

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING**

**4 December 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

Montlake Library  
2040 East Madison Street  
City Monorail Implementation Team

Convened: 8:30am

Adjourned: 2:00pm

Commissioners Present

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

Staff Present

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

---

**4 Dec 2003** Project: **Montlake Library**

Phase: Design Development Details

Previous Reviews: 2 October 2003 (Design Development), 20 March 2003 (Schematic Design), 21 November 2003 (Pre-Design)

Presenters: Richard Yancey, Weinstein AU  
Barbara Swift, Swift and Company  
Justine Kim, Seattle Public LibraryAttendees: John Taylor, Seattle City Council Staff  
Jeff Joslin, City of Portland Design Commission  
Matt Aalfs, Weinstein AU

Time: 1 hour (SDC Ref. # 221 | DC00110)

**Action:** The Commission thanks the team for the presentation of the landscape design, art and building details and would like to make the following comments and recommendations.

- **The Design Commission strongly supports the landscape design: the placement of the building into the sloped site with the “shelves” described by the team, appreciates the combination of intimately scaled elements with larger gestures, and the careful handling of sight lines and views.**
- **urges the team to reconsider the strategic placement and type of trees in front of the buildings and views to and from the library;**
- **appreciates the consistency between the careful handling of light in the architectural design and the way the artist is also working with the introduction of light into the building, and encourages her to continue exploring ideas that animate the floor and allow the floor to become a part of the art;**
- **likes the window seats between the book stacks and the spaces created there, but suggests simplifying the east interior elevation and possibly finding a different location for the carrels;**
- **likes the elegance of the structural solution in the new trusses;**
- **suggests that the team give more consideration to the base of the building in terms of enhancing the pedestrian experience and consider bringing natural light into the parking garage, as shown in original designs;**
- **Feels very strongly that the brick exterior is a central component of the design and would be seriously concerned if it were removed from this project;**
- **and recommends approval of final design development details.**

The Commission has already approved the design development for this project, but requested this meeting in order to review the landscape in more detail and also the artwork. Because the project demands most of the site the landscape needs to work in a small space. The goals of the landscape design are to support:

- The civic function of the library
- The particular context of the library in this neighborhood

The neighborhood is made up primarily of homogeneous but highly textured single family detached houses. There is a commercial lot across the street to the south of the library, but it is an anomaly in the

urban fabric. This small retail cluster only extends a couple of blocks to the south of the site.

The landscape architect would like to incorporate regional views to the cascades and the arboretum, while also creating a highly textured landscape that operates on an intimate scale. The landscape will be divided into 3-4 distinct areas. The landscape along 24<sup>th</sup> Street will be the most public, while the landscape to the west will be the most highly textured. In addressing the busy street the landscape will create a sense of repose and simplicity. Where the landscape addresses the residential community it will incorporate a high degree of texture in the plant material.

In addition to responding to the specific contextual conditions on each side of the site the landscape will also work with the 13-15 foot grade change across the site. On the southwest of the site adjacent to the main entrance the grade will be stepped in a very intentional tiered manner. In this area there will be a grove of trees with a very low cover of foliage. This will allow people sitting in the reading room of the library to see over the tops of the trees to the arboretum beyond. A lower maple species will be used in this area. On the northern edge of the site the landscape architect would like to create a screen between the parking and the adjacent residents. In the southwest corner which needs to remain mostly open in terms of its function she would like to have one magnificent tree. Along E McGraw St a strategy of stepped planes similar to those along 24<sup>th</sup> will be used. The garden in the NW corner of the site will primarily be a viewing garden. There will be a door that will allow emergency egress, but it will not be open generally to the public. There is however the possibility that it could be used for specific groups or book clubs. The team wants the courtyard to look complete even when it is not occupied. They do not want to have benches that would often look empty. There could be other elements in the garden that people could sit on, just not benches specifically.

Some modifications have been made to the interior of the building since the previous review by the Commission. The community had requested not to have such a large expanse of glass along the east side of the building. In response to this request the design team had incorporated a series of wood panels into the façade which have become built in bookcases. These bookcases house some of the library's collection, allow people to occupy the window wall, and also accommodate part of the mechanical system. Since adding the built-in bookcases the design team has allowed them to inform the layout of the rest of the floor. Now the floor plan is arranged into zones of transparency and zones of book shelves, which are parallel to the built in shelves. This new plan layout eliminated some carrels so the design team has incorporated carrels in between the bookcases. The carrels will alternate with built in benches between the bookshelves. There will be two benches and two carrels. The benches will be designed as floating benches that span from one bookshelf to another. The benches will have padded back rests across the glass. The padded bench seats will be divided into sections to accommodate multiple seating groups. The design team is also studying adding a light shelf above the carrels and desks that will bring daylight further into the space.

The design team has further resolved the structural solution for the ceiling. The concept has always been to have a floating warm ceiling, but the structural solution was not fully resolved. Roof beams are spaced at 8 feet on center with columns every 16 feet. The team has developed a truss with a king post as a compression member and thin metal tension wires. The structural solution for the last bay over the entrance has not yet been resolved. The team would like this area to have a unique solution that celebrates the building entry.

The artist working on this project is currently teaching in Rome so she is not able to present her work in person to the Design Commission. The community process delayed the schedule for this project and the artist had already committed to teaching abroad. Her ideas for this project involve the process of photography and also camera obscuras as well as lenses that allow people to spy on people in other parts of the building. She has also been developing a sundial idea. This idea would involve a series of

apertures or skylights in the gasket/entrance area of the building. These openings would be a series of bright colors which would paint with light across the library. This sundial could also mark important dates in Montlake's history as the light moves across the floor during different times of the year. The artist has been working with the lighting lab to explore the sundial concept.

### **Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns**

- Questions if the skylights would be in the entrance area only.
  - Proponents stated that the skylights would be in the entrance area only but that the light would extend further into the library into the children's area.
- Applauds the idea of a simple landscape design. Feels that the "backyard" landscape design is really good.
- Feels that the landscape design in the front and the side of the building may be too similar. Suggests that the landscape design in the front of the building could be simplified to make it more stately and to distinguish it from other landscape areas.
- Likes that the art is grappling with the same issues that the building is in terms of bringing light into the building. Suggests that the artist look at how light animates the floor of the building. Recommends that the artist could look at using different materials that would change as the light hits them.
- Appreciates the care of all of the building details. Likes how the building is set into the landscape.
- Loves the window wall concept, but is concerned about the carrels. Notes that psychologically the carrels have a different feeling than the benches. Explains that people would occupy that type of space in a different way.
  - Proponents noted that the only tables in the library are next to the young adults section. They are concerned that the tables will be taken over by teenagers doing their homework. They library likes the carrels because they provide another seating option.
- Notes that the library has a very intimate scale, more like the scale of a house. Remarks that there will only be two benches and two carrels. Suggests that the team consider doing something to occupy the window wall on the west façade as well.
- Suggests that there could be low trees close to the front of the building, as proposed, but there could also be a line of columnar trees between the windows which would give the landscape a more civic feeling and would distinguish the landscaping in the front of the building from the landscaping at the side of the building.
- Notes that there are a lot of different things happening in the window wall in a very small space. Wonders how people in the carrels will feel having their knees face the windows.
- Suggests that the carrels could be located in the back of the building facing the private garden.
- Wonders how the visibility within the library has changed with the new layout.
  - Proponents stated that the visibility in the library is equal or better than in the previous layout. Notes that the view on entering the library is more open as you see only the short side of the bookshelves.
- Likes the idea of having carrels built into the window walls. Agrees that the location of the carrels could change. Would not like the carrels as an element to disappear from the design entirely.
- Wonders what the experience of entering the library will be like for people who drive in and park downstairs. Suspects that it will be a bleak experience compared to the rest of the library. Wonders if

there could be more natural light introduced into the parking area.

- Questions if there were originally slats in the wall of the parking garage.
  - Proponents stated that there were originally slats, but that they wanted to create a plinth for the building to sit on. Notes that transparency could be introduced into the brick.
- Wonders how the brick fits with the budget. Is concerned that the brick could be value engineered out of the project.
  - Proponents explained that this project will go before the library board soon and that the review will include whether the brick can be included in the budget. They noted that the brick is a very small budget item compared to the rest of the project.
- Feels that the parti of the building responds more to the residential scale of the adjacent neighborhood than to the scale of the adjacent commercial development.
  - Proponents explained that the intention was to orient the project toward the commercial development through the location of the main entrance and also through the scale of the building.
- Wonders what the groundcover is in the landscaped area behind the building.
  - Proponents explained that the ground cover is a combination of different species which will be 75% native species. The low species will include ginger, woodruff, and lily turf. The medium sized plants will include deer fern, low Oregon grape, and dogwood. The tallest plants will include honey suckle, sword fern and yew. The plants will range in color from very bright green to very dark green.
- Appreciates the new structural solution for spanning from column to column and looks forward to seeing the structural design for the area over the entry.

#### **Key Visitor Comments and Concerns**

- Notes that there is a large expanse of brick on the public exposure of the north wall above eye level. Is concerned that this could have a bunker like feeling to pedestrians. Suggests that the team could work with the suggestion to introduce natural light into the parking area, and at the same time relieve this façade and add detail at a human scale.

---

**4 Dec 2003** Project: **2040 East Madison Street**

Phase: Alley Vacation

Previous Review: 21 August 2003(Alley Vacation), 1 May 2003(Alley Vacation)

Presenters: Ron Jelaco, Sclater Partners Architects

Jay Reeves, Sclater Partners Architects

Attendees: Beverly Barnett, SDOT

Marilyn Senour, City of Seattle

Andrew Taylor, Miller Park Neighborhood

Sheila Weir, Community Member

Barry Lamb, Barry J. Lamb Inc.

Time: 1 hour (SDC Ref. # 170 | DC00304)

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

- **Based on the urban design analysis presented, feels that the proposed alley vacation is justified, given the size of the existing alley, that it is not required to provide the utilities and services to the building, which are provided by the alley to the west, and also because the proposed development responds to the pattern and scale of the existing alley;**
- **assumes that the services that would be handled by a traditional alley will not be handled on the street, but will be handled in the adjacent north-south alley to the west of the site;**
- **Feels that the public benefits of widening the sidewalks, creating additional public space in the courtyard, and creating additional retail space that faces the courtyard are appropriate;**
- **notes that this will be a hard building to develop, but feels that the team is moving in the right direction in terms of creating a community asset and one that has the potential to have good eyes on the street;**
- **recognizes that the success of this scheme rests with the courtyard and will be dependent on the quality of the retail and ensuring that the rear doors between the retail space and the courtyard are permanent;**
- **challenges the team to develop design details that will increase people's perception, as they pass by the site, that something is happening in the courtyard, and encourages the team to consider the public quality of what is at the end of the axis as one enters the courtyard, through the transparency of the retail area or through the location of the central element in the courtyard;**
- **Suggests that the team consider leaving a trace of the existing alley as an historical reference;**
- **And recommends approval of the alley vacation.**

This is the third review of this project by the Design Commission. This project is also being reviewed concurrently by the Design Review Board. At the previous meeting the Design Commission felt that they could not recommend approval of the alley vacation. The design team and the owner have gone back to the drawing board.

The design team's approach to this project is that the neighborhood will have more impact on the building



than the building will have on the neighborhood. The site for this project is at a critical point in the neighborhood where Madison St changes its angle in order to go down the hill. It is a very idiosyncratic site. It sits at the southern edge of the Capitol Hill housing district and on Madison St which is a classic high street with lots of traffic and lots of activity on the street.

In changing the design the team didn't want to lose the sense of a courtyard. They feel that the façade on Madison should be dignified. The sides of the façade bookending the courtyard should match so that you feel like you are walking into the building not around it. There will be a clear distinction between the retail and the residential portions of the building. This should help articulate that the building is occupied 24

hours a day. The building could potentially reconnect over the entrance to the courtyard on the third or fourth level like the Smith Tower.

The corner of Denny Way and Madison St is an acute angle that is highly visible. This is a critical corner which needs to be architecturally significant as it serves as the gateway into the Capitol Hill residential district. There is also a long visual axis down 21<sup>st</sup> St that terminates on the site, very close to the northern end of the alley which is proposed to be vacated. This is an important axis which terminates on the other end with the Meany School. The southwest corner of the site is difficult to work with because it is an extremely acute angle. Part of this corner might be dedicated as public space.



In the previous design there was a courtyard one level above the street, which was a private courtyard. The courtyard is now proposed on grade as a public space. Access to the courtyard would be controlled between midnight and 6am but otherwise would be open to the

public. The team would like to have retail cafes that spill out into this courtyard. Parking would be underground, and the courtyard would be surrounded by double sided residential with one side facing the street and one side facing into the courtyard. The design team has been looking at precedents for this courtyard from Seattle and from other cities around the world. The area of the alley which would be



vacated would be given back to the public as a wider sidewalk along Madison St. The portion of the new building facing the residential development across Denny Way will be lower than the rest of the building and will include semi-private stoops facing the street.

The size of the existing alley is too small to provide the usual services of an alley. There has never been any utility service in the alley. Currently the alley is closed between 6pm and

6am. The design team feels that the alley was badly designed when it was initially laid out.

**Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns**

- Wonders if the courtyard space is open to the southwest to connect to the north-south alley.
  - Proponents feel that it would be a bad idea for the courtyard to open onto this alley. They feel that there is a safety issue with pedestrians walking into traffic, and also a security issue. There may be a gate on this side of the courtyard so that it can be used for service access, but not as a pedestrian connection.
- Notes that the critical issues in an alley vacation are access and services.
  - Proponents reiterated that the alley is not currently serving these functions. They further explained that the north-south alley to the west of the site will be used for access and services to the site.
- Is pleased that the scale and building orientation creates a visual break where the alley currently is. This divides the building into a retail zone and a residential zone.
- Feels that the design team has been very responsive to the odd shaped lot and the odd alley connection.
- Commends the team on how far they have come in changing their approach.
- Appreciates the intention to move the public space from the alley to the outside of the site along the sidewalk.
- Thinks that the urban design analysis is excellent. It includes all of the elements that the Commission likes to see, but doesn't often see. Feels that this analysis has led to a scheme that takes advantage of a quirky site.
- Wonders if there is any history of pedestrian use of the alley.
  - Proponents stated that there isn't.
- Wonders what will draw people into the courtyard and let them know it is a public space.
  - Proponents stated that people may not discover the courtyard the first time they pass it. It might take them two or three times before they notice it.
- Suggests that the courtyard could be distinguished through paving or art that would draw people into the space.
  - Proponents explained that they want the courtyard to feel like a continuation of the residential space.
- Feels that the team has created a scheme that has great potential as a public space. Notes that things beyond paving could be done to activate the space. Suggests that the water element could be brought forward closer to the entrance of the courtyard.
- Remarks the apartments that face onto the entry to the courtyard could intimidate people and not encourage them to see it as a public space. Recommends that the transparency of the retail spaces could wrap into the courtyard.
- Notes that it is always a challenge to draw the public into spaces that are essentially on private property.
- Is reassured that this project will have a vested interest in making sure that they create a viable public space.
- Would like assurance that access from the retail space to the courtyard will be maintained.

- Suggests that a cultural trace of the alley could remain which would read through the design.

**Key Visitor Comments and Concerns**

- Is pleased with the development of the project, but is concerned that the traffic study being conducted will not be accurate. Notes that there are a lot of new projects being developed in the area which will dramatically change the amount of traffic. Explains that a traffic study done now will not capture what the traffic will be like in the future. Remarks that there is an alley to the north of the site which historically wasn't in use, but now has begun to be used.
- Thinks it would be a great asset to the proposed retail and the neighborhood if they alley could be used for delivery to the new building.
- Is worried about parking and traffic. Would also like to see retail on the opposite side of the courtyard.
  - Proponents noted that the current zoning will not allow retail on that side of the courtyard.

---

**4 Dec 2003** Project: **City Monorail Implementation Team**  
Phase: Quarterly Briefing  
Previous Reviews: 18 September 2003 (Quarterly Review)  
Presenters: Cheryl Sizov, DPD  
Ethan Melone, SDOT  
Vanessa Murdock, DPD  
Scott Dvorak, DPD  
David Graves, DPD  
Lisa Rutzick, DPD  
Attendees: Rachel Ben-Shmuel, Seattle Monorail Project  
Bill Bascus, Seattle Monorail Project

Time: 1 hour (SDC Ref. # 170 | DC00231)

**Summary:** The Commission thanked the team for the quarterly update on two aspects of the City's efforts, design review and station area planning, and would like to make the following comments and recommendations.

- The Design Commission is pleased to see the way in which the station area planning work is moving ahead. They appreciate that the team has identified access issues as critical to the communities and appreciate that the team is keeping the issues of placemaking and stewardship on the table;
- encourages the team to continue to look at parking and parking integration particularly at the West Seattle stations, but also along the entire alignment and also to keep the focus on bus access at all of the stations;
- commends the team for the station area planning summary materials being distributed at the public workshops now underway;
- urges the city to continue to keep pressure on SMP to provide adequate space at the stations to allow for successful integration of the system into the city, perhaps taking the approach of a public development authority (PDA) to avoid possible problems with leftover parcels of land around the stations;
- wants to issue a strong caution to the Mayor and to City Council about the potential problems of the rushed DBOM RFP and the overall project schedule and the pressure this puts on the City to maintain design quality and not appear as an obstacle in the public eye. Also, more generally, a caution about the risk the City faces in term of public perception if the relationship between the City and SMP becomes sour. Potential conflicts exist between the City's responsibility to oversee how this massive piece of infrastructure is integrated into the urban fabric and SMP's commitment to bring the project in "on time and on budget". All parties need to recognize that the rush to issue the DBOM RFP and lock into a guaranteed cost could leave little room to negotiate design quality;
- and for reasons relating to the urban design and use of city streets, would like to recommend that SMP be responsible for the complete removal of the system at the end of its design life, or when the system ceases to be used for its transportation purpose if that occurs prior to the end of the design life of the structures.

This is a quarterly update from the City's Monorail Implementation team. The team has asked The

Seattle Monorail Project (SMP) to provide them with access plans for each of the stations. SMP will develop these plans in conjunction with the City and METRO. These plans will include the basic configuration including which side of the street the station will be on, the height of the beam, and the location and type of the switches. Final review and approval of the access plans will be done by the city.

SMP will be getting less revenue than was originally expected. In order to resolve the project scope with the budget they have decided to speed up the request for Proposals (RFP) and bid process rather than having in house engineers produce a cost estimate before putting the project out to bid. The RFP deadline will be in February and bids will be due by May. The final environmental impact statement (EIS) for the Monorail project will be in March. It is likely that the final alignment approval will be in April. There has been an ongoing question as to whether the use approvals will be concurrent with the alignment approval.

### **Monorail Review Panel (MRP)**

The MRP has shifted from trying to review all 19 stations before the RFP to looking at seven of the stations as well as the two bridges. The seven stations chosen to be reviewed before the RFP were picked to be representative of the different conditions along the alignment. The City will also be developing design guidelines to help regulate the station designs. DPD staff, SMP and City Council staff will meet to develop these guidelines. Lesley Bain will be available to assist with this process. The timing of the guidelines has not yet been finalized. There will likely be a draft of the guidelines by March.

The FEIS for the monorail will not be able to respond to the City's design guidelines because they will not be adopted in time. But the FEIS will respond to the guidelines being developed by SMP. It is possible that the city may use parts of SMP's guidelines in its guidelines.

The MRP just had an all day work session to systematically review all of the stations and the alignment. Prior to this meeting all of the panel members attended one of the two public open houses. The panel identified four main issues that they want to address:

- urban design issues of the switches
- Ballard bridge
- West Seattle Bridge
- Seattle Center alignment

The MRP has talked to council staff about writing a letter regarding the MRP's position on the alignment. The panel will send a summary letter soon and final letter by the end of the year.

Previously the MRP had been debating the value of reviewing stations before the alignment was approved. They have found that there is value in moving back and forth between the different scales. SMP provided MRP with engineering sections of the alignment which were very helpful, although they did not show the guideway dimension or the adjacent buildings. MRP felt that these sections were critically important for their review.

Proponents noted that the switches sound innocuous but are actually enormous. The switches are not just changes in the track, but are actually large roofs over the street. There are more switches required due to the proposed single track in some locations, some switches would be required even with the double track configuration.

### **Station Area Planning**

The Station area planners are in the middle of the first in a series of community workshops. A total of

six community workshops will be held in the first series..

The meetings have been focused on the themes that are being studied by the station area planners:

- Access – how people get to the stations and how they leave the station when they get to their final destination
- Placemaking – defining the character of the place – defining the existing character - or giving new character
- Stewardship – finding out what areas are treasured by the community and thought of as resources – making sure that the monorail does not compromise these

The station area planning staff has identified access, placemaking and stewardship issues and will be discussing in the context of the workshops what opportunities and implications are presented by the arrival of the Monorail. The next step will be to develop station area scenarios, from which draft station area action plans will be developed after another round of community workshops in the spring.. The format for these action plans has not yet been developed.

Some of the public workshops held to date have generated more discussion than other but all have been well attended. Attendees included a lot of people who do not typically attend community meetings. The workshops were useful as an opportunity to explain to the public the distinction between the proponent (SMP) and the City's implementation team. Discussion included how some of the stations are acting as twins. One pair of stations is the Mercer/Elliott station and the Key Arena station. There was a suggestion from a community member that the West Seattle Junction Station could reach out to include the next adjacent station.

At the West Seattle workshop which addressed the Morgan Junction, West Seattle Junction and Avalon stations, the community was very concerned about parking. In the workshops held thus far, people were having trouble getting beyond the access issues. The station area planners tried to prompt the community gently to see if they feel that there are any land use or urban design implications. A few people did mention the idea of having higher density housing near the stations. The station area planning does not include a transit oriented development component because almost all of the station areas along the alignment are in an urban village.

### **Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns**

- Questions what the impact of the maintenance yard at the south end of the alignment will be. Notes that some switches could be within the maintenance yard instead of in the public right of way.
- Notes that the access issues seem huge. These range from disabled access to bus access. Wonders if there are ways of breaking up the access issues into smaller groups.
  - Proponents noted that access issues are tending to take longer than placemaking and stewardship issues.
- Remarks that the Morgan Junction Station is intriguing because of the proximity of the the Fauntleroy Ferry. Wonders how the community feels about having the station that is at the end of the line. Wonders if a parking garage is being considered.
  - Proponents agreed that people are very concerned about parking. Some community members would like to have a parking garage, but others are concerned about the garage being empty in the middle of the neighborhood. Some people have suggested seeing if parking becomes a problem and then deciding whether or not to build a garage. The EIS will need to include parking mitigation. They noted that integration with Metro buses

could also alleviate some parking issues.

- Thinks that the station area planning work is great. Wants to emphasize the importance of coordinating with the buses. Notes that this could affect the ideal location of stations.
- Understands that the Monorail is looking to reduce costs by purchasing the minimal amount of land possible at each of the stations. Is worried about the long term implications of this. Notes that the on and off ramps for I-5 were shoe horned into the city in an attempt to minimize their impact. Remarks that they are hard to use especially for people who are not familiar with the city.
- Suggests that this might be an issue that could be handled by a public development authority (PDA). Notes that the spaces adjacent to the stations will be critical to the success of the project.
- Notes that the current site proposal and associated property acquisition at the terminal station in Ballard may leave an unusable piece of land.
- Remarks that if we are thinking boldly enough to build the kind of high bridges that are being proposed we should be thinking equally boldly about the stations.
- Is concerned about the contractors doing the cost estimates before the stations have been designed. Is worried that once the station is actually being built it won't be possible to be constructed within the budget.
- Notes that if the station location changes the station will go back to the MRP for review. Wonders what happens if the station location remains the same but the size of the station gets smaller.
- Questions what will be fixed in the RFP and what will be able to be changed. Acknowledges that a balance needs to be found between wanting to have the cost estimate ASAP, and the inability to have all of the design work done by February.
- Notes that some areas would be better handled by allowances. Adds that bids would be very high anyway because of the high level of uncertainty.
- Notes that the Mayor has expressed interest in slowing down the schedule.
  - Proponents clarified that the Mayor is not interested in slowing down the schedule, but in making sure that the City has the information it needs.
  - Proponents also noted that SMP speeding up their schedule does not obligate MRP to speed up theirs.
- Questions if the city could require a minimum land purchase at each of the stations.
  - Proponents stated that the city cannot require another entity to purchase land, but the city could require specific circulation elements at each of the stations.
- Is concerned that once the contract is set with the design build operate and maintain (DBOM) contractors that the station components will not be able to be changed.
  - Proponents noted that the City is a third party with regard to the contract between SMP and the DBOM contractor. Explains that the City is not bound by this contract. The City is concerned with station integration and less so with bringing the project in on time and on budget. If the City's requirements conflict with the contract that is an issue between SMP and their contractor.
- Worries that that this situation is setting up a public relations issue where the SMP will say that the monorail can be built within a certain budget and the City will be put in the position of saying that it can't.

**4 December 2003 Commission Business**

- |                         |    |  |
|-------------------------|----|--|
| <b>ACTION ITEMS</b>     | A. | <u>TIMESHEETS</u>  |
|                         | B. | <u>MINUTES FROM 20 NOVEMBER 2003</u> - TABLED  |
| <b>DISCUSSION ITEMS</b> | C. | <u>DPD PLANNING DISCUSSION NEXT STEPS</u> - SPIKER   |
|                         | D. | <u>DC RETREAT 2004</u> - CUBELL  |
|                         | E. | <u>OUTSIDE COMMITMENTS UPDATE</u> - ALL  |
| <b>ANNOUNCEMENTS</b>    | F. | <u>ARCADE RELEASE</u> - DEC 4 <sup>TH</sup> , PETER MILLER BOOKS, 5:30-7:30PM                |
|                         | G. | <u>THINKING IN PUBLIC EXHIBIT</u> - CDA GALLERY, SMITH TOWER,<br>DEC 4 <sup>TH</sup> , 6-8PM |