

FILE COPY

WASHINGTON STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT RESEARCH PROGRAM
REPORT

2.1A

GUIDELINES FOR JOINT DEVELOPMENT ON STATE HIGHWAY TRANSPORTATION WAYS

INTERSTATE 5 TEST CASES (SUPPLEMENT)

RESEARCH PROJECT

Y - 1407

APRIL 1972

PREPARED FOR
WASHINGTON STATE HIGHWAY COMMISSION
IN COOPERATION WITH
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

JACK E. VAN ZANDT
PROJECT MANAGER
STANFORD RESEARCH INSTITUTE
MENLO PARK
CALIFORNIA 94025

1. Report No.		2. Government Accession No.		3. Recipient's Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subtitle GUIDELINES FOR JOINT DEVELOPMENT ON STATE HIGHWAY TRANSPORTATION WAYS, INTERSTATE 5 TEST CASES (SUPPLEMENT)				5. Report Date April 1972	
				6. Performing Organization Code	
7. Author(s) Jack E. Van Zandt, et al				8. Performing Organization Report No. 1162	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Stanford Research Institute Menlo Park, California 94025				10. Work Unit No.	
				11. Contract or Grant No. Y-1407	
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address Washington State Department of Highways Highway Administration Building Olympia, Washington 98504				13. Type of Report and Period Covered Final Report 4/71 -- 4/72	
				14. Sponsoring Agency Code	
15. Supplementary Notes Conducted in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration. Project Title: Joint Development/Multiple Use Transportation Ways					
16. Abstract <p>The objective of this study was to present criteria and procedures for evaluation of Joint Development (JD) above, below, or beside state highways. Application of the procedures are illustrated over a wide range of joint development situations, both (1) for establishing state or local JD policy, and (2) for making decisions about JD projects in a more timely and comprehensive manner, and in a way that will contribute toward improving the quality of urban life or the enhancement of rural environments. The approach taken in the Guidelines is sequential, systematic, and interdisciplinary; that is, it uses a series of successively more detailed and comprehensive planning and evaluation procedures for JD decision making relying on a wide range of specified physical, economic, social and legal criteria. In use, the Guidelines envision a three-stage planning and evaluation process: (1) identification of the need or potential for JD projects; (2) comparison of project proposals against policies, criteria, and standards designed to avoid or minimize negative impacts and increase favorable impacts; and (3) refined definition of costs and benefits when warranted.</p> <p>This supplement to the Guidelines report (described above) presents the results of analyzing seven actual JD proposals, located along Interstate 5 in the State of Washington, according to the procedures suggested in the Guidelines.</p>					
17. Key Words Joint Development Multiple Use Highway Planning Environmental Impact				18. Distribution Statement	
19. Security Classif. (of this report) Unclassified		20. Security Classif. (of this page) Unclassified		21. No. of Pages 103	22. Price

PREFACE

Supervision of this project for the Washington State Highway Commission, Department of Highways, was the responsibility of the Assistant Director, Planning, Research and State Aid. General direction was provided by Willa W. Mylroie, Research and Special Assignments Engineer. Mr. Ray Dinsmore, Research Coordinator, and Mr. William R. Turner, Consultant Liason Engineer, were administrative and technical coordinators, respectively.

At SRI the principal investigator and project manager was Jack E. Van Zandt. Major contributors to the work were David A. Curry, Arnold J. Katz, Dr. Gordon Thompson, Gordon F. Jensen, and Karen B. Lee.

Consultants to SRI were Redford Engineers, Civil Engineers, principally represented by B. Richal Smith; Eckbo, Dean, Austin & Williams, Environmental Planners, principally represented by Timothy J. Downey; and Wilson, Jones, Morton & Lynch, Attorneys at Law, represented by Michael R. Nave.

The contents of this report reflect the views of the authors who are responsible for the facts and the accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the State or the Federal Highway Administration. This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation.

CONTENTS

PREFACE	11
INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY	1
RAVENNA BOULEVARD TENNIS COURTS	8
NORTHSHORE AND SOUTHSORE VIEW POINT PARKS	22
PARK PLAZA	34
CHERRY STREET RAMP PARKING GARAGE	49
HARBORVIEW GARAGE AND VIEW PARK	65
INTER-IM MULTIPURPOSE CENTER	78
CONNECTICUT STREET INTERCHANGE	90

TABLES

Table 1	WORKSHEET 2 SUMMARY BASIC POLICY ANALYSIS	6
Table 2	WORKSHEET 3 SUMMARY GENERAL CRITERIA ANALYSIS	6

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to present the results of analyzing seven case examples of Joint Development proposals. The analyses were conducted during preparation of the "Guidelines for Joint Development on State Highway Transportation Ways." The examples are all located along Interstate 5, the Seattle Freeway, within a zone bounded on the north and south by N.E. 75th and Andover Streets, respectively, in the City of Seattle.

Although much of the "Guideline" report's content was based on literature search, technical and methodological research, and the expertise of the research team members, the test case studies were instrumental in guiding certain Guideline features relative to (1) the development of the evaluation procedure; (2) identification of critical criteria towards determining JDP feasibility; (3) community goals establishment; and (4) methods used for determining criteria compliance. In this regard, the assistance provided and the time given by the Washington State Department of Highway's staff, especially those in District 7, is acknowledged and gratefully appreciated.

Method of Approach

The following procedure was utilized in conducting the test cases.

Preliminary Screening of WSDH Files

Early in the research study, eighty-one Permit and Airspace Lease files were thoroughly reviewed for the purpose of gaining an insight into the potential for identifying appropriate case examples for further consideration.

Approximately one-half of the file cases were readily discarded by reason of prior denial, postponement or withdrawal; inappropriateness; or simply their "permit" orientation. After further review and discussion with highway staff, the forty remaining were then screened down to about eighteen candidates by reason that the others were outside the test zone, or that they represented only minor uses of small remnant parcels or relatively narrow 'edge' strips within the highway right-of-way.

Field Examination of Potential Test Cases

In September of 1971, a field trip along I-5 was made by representatives from Headquarters, District 7, and the SRI research team. Nine of the eighteen potential sites were selected by the District for on-site examination.

Final Test Case Selection

After several additional field examinations by separate members of the research team during the month of October, reexamination of file information, and preliminary discussions with some of the cosponsors, the research team finally selected the seven test cases described in this report. These are as follows, together with the primary reason for their selection, and in the order in which they are presented in this report:

- Ravenna Boulevard Tennis Courts--located in a residential area, this case presented an example where a portion of an originally planned JDP of larger size actually exists and accordingly certain 'after-the-fact' information could be obtained.
- Northshore and Southshore View Point Parks--located under the Lake Washington Ship Canal Bridge in combination industrial and residential areas, this case raised the community-wide (if not region-wide) question of natural resource preservation in an area of diminishing resources (i.e., public water front access).

- Park Plaza (including East Plaza Parking Facility)--located in the CBD, this case offers an example of not only a significant JDP in the Seattle area but also a milestone example nationwide of 'bridging' areas separated by an urban freeway.
- Cherry Street Ramp Parking Garage--located in a commercial/governmental area of downtown Seattle, this case uniquely presents the question of family relocation.
- Harborview Parking Garage and View Park--located in a combination multi-residential and institutional (medical) use area, this case clearly suggests the abandonment of the "highest and best" economic use in preference to neighborhood and community values relative to land use and visual amenity.
- Inter-Im Multipurpose Center--located on the commercial/high density residential fringe south of the City's commercial district, this case involves not only cosponsorship by a local group of the community, but also a chance to reestablish neighborhood relationships severed by the construction of the freeway.
- Connecticut Street Interchange--located in an industrial district south of the CBD, this proposal for municipal employee parking and Seattle Transit bus storage offers the only example where completion of the highway element has yet to be constructed.

Observation, Interviews, and Investigation

Field work was then conducted on a more intensive basis of the selected project proposals, consisting of further site observation (e.g., pedestrian and vehicular traffic movements, existing physical advantages and constraints, scale limitations, etc.); interviews with potentially affected persons (e.g., pedestrians, tenants, users, site neighbors, etc.), with cosponsors and/or their professional consultants, and with staff and officials of public groups serving in an approving capacity; and (when available) the

review of design features and standards used or to be used in the JD design through discussions with appropriate WSDH highway and non-highway engineers and architects. While complete information was not available on all seven JD proposals, enough data were obtained either to reach judgments concerning the desirability of each proposal or to identify further study needs relative to the proposal.

This work was carried out by research team professionals skilled in highway, structural, and traffic engineering, city and environmental planning,* urban economics, sociology, and psychology.

Report Structure

The first part of the next seven sections of this report is a general discussion of the JD proposal, incorporating comments from SRI's sociological and economic field studies and conclusions regarding the proposal and its alternatives. Following this in sequential order are:

- Worksheet 1, JDP Proposal Identification Form
- Worksheet 2, Basic Policy Analysis Summary
- Worksheet 3, General Criteria Analysis Summary
- Worksheet 4, Comparative Display Chart (For the Ravenna Boulevard Tennis Courts case where it was found appropriate for use)
- Report of Eckbo, Dean, Austin & Williams/Jones & Jones (EDAW/JJ), Seattle, Washington
- Report of Redford Engineers (RE), Bellevue, Washington

* Assisting Eckbo, Dean, Austin & Williams in the field work was an associated firm based in Seattle--Jones & Jones (then Grant Jones Associates), Landscape Architects and Environmental Planners.

Overall Summary of the Test Cases

Broadly speaking, the analysis supports the desirability of all JD proposals reviewed with the exception that (1) the alternative to the Ravenna Boulevard Tennis Courts of University of Washington student parking deserves consideration; (2) construction of a parking garage at the Cherry Street offramps (still in the talking stage) should be considered in relation to alternative sites on vacant land and other possibilities that may be of interest to the City of Seattle; (3) the alternative of doing nothing about transit bus parking, or even extensive employee parking, at the Connecticut Street Interchange should be considered as a means of retaining some open space (i.e., an "air reservoir") in a growing industrial area.

Tables 1 and 2 provide a numerical summary of the results of rating the seven JD proposals on Worksheets 2 and 3. Affirmative ratings were all clustered in the 70 to 80 range on Worksheet 2 for all proposals except the Cherry Street Ramp Parking Garage, which was only rated slightly over 50 percent affirmative, due probably to its very tentative and undefined nature at present. Interpretation of Worksheet 3 results is more complex because the total number of applicable items varies more than in Worksheet 2.* At least 62 percent (or approximately a 2/3-1/3 ratio) of the Worksheet 3 criteria were "Adequately Met" for each JD proposal except the Cherry Street Ramp Garage and the Connecticut Street Interchange; most of the other criteria were rated "Some Question Exists." Such questions are indicative of the need for clarification or study of a particular issue, and do not necessarily constitute "Unfavorable Met" ratings. See introduction to Guideline Section 5 for further explanation of this point.

* In particular, item 5.2.3, Site and Spillover Effects, was reduced to a single general entry for most proposals but was shown in detail as 9 entries for the larger, more complex JD proposals.

Table 1

WORKSHEET 2 SUMMARY
BASIC POLICY ANALYSIS

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Percent Affirmative</u>
Ravenna Boulevard Tennis Courts	15	4	79
Northshore and Southshore View Point Parts	18	6	75
Park Plaza	17	5	77
Cherry Street Ramp Parking Garage	11	10	52-1/2
Harborview Garage and View Park	17	5	77
Inter-Im Multipurpose Center	17	4	81
Connecticut Street Interchange	14	5	73-1/2

Table 2

WORKSHEET 3 SUMMARY
GENERAL CRITERIA ANALYSES

	<u>Percent</u>		
	<u>Adequately Met</u>	<u>Some Question Exists</u>	<u>Unfavorably Met</u>
Ravenna Boulevard Tennis Courts	62	32	6
Northshore and Southshore View Point Park	70	28	2
Park Plaza	65	31	4
Cherry Street Ramp Parking Garage	23	68	9
Harborview Garage and View Park	76	24	0
Inter-Im Multipurpose Center	62	38	0
Connecticut Street Interchange	52	41	7

Conclusions for Joint Development Planning and Evaluation

The analysis also supports the following general conclusions regarding JDP analysis procedures:

- The need for combining the use of the worksheets provided in the Guideline report as checklist summaries with narrative statements (1) interpreting or expanding on the worksheets and (2) reaching conclusions regarding the JD proposal and its alternatives. Narrative statements and worksheets thus serve complementary purposes in the analysis (as they also would if the General Criteria Analysis is used in preparing environmental impact statements).
- The value of a centralized filing system for JDP proposals containing maps, reports, correspondence, interdepartmental memorandums and technical reviews, purchase/lease documents, and all other information pertinent to each proposed project.
- The value of receiving actual drawings (if only schematic) of the proposed JDP from the cosponsor at the earliest feasible time, especially prior to the completion of Worksheet 3, General Criteria Analysis Summary.
- The significant value of sight inspection and visual observation of the land uses and activities that reflect the community needs and views, human dynamics, level of vitality, and other real-life conditions that exist at and near the proposed JDP site.
- That although most of the case examples yet to be approved and implemented questioned the need for using the Comparative Display Chart (Worksheet 4) and the Extended Evaluation Form (Worksheet 5), at least at this time, two conclusions appeared clear--(1) Worksheet 4 serves, among other reasons cited in the Guideline, as an excellent self-checking tool for the analyst prior to providing his recommendation concerning a JDP; and (2) Worksheet 5 will have its greatest use when there is a question of alternate JD proposals for, say, the same location.

RAVENNA BOULEVARD TENNIS COURTS

General Discussion

The City of Seattle proposed construction of seven tennis courts under the elevated freeway structure at this site, and a permit for the purpose was issued in 1966. One tennis court has been built, but a city bond proposal in which financing of the other courts was included was defeated at the polls in 1970.

Observation of the installed tennis court reveals a relatively high noise level from the freeway and contrasting areas of sunshine and shade that can contribute to the difficulty of seeing the ball. Interviews were also conducted with people in the surrounding neighborhood regarding the court. Those interviewed were all white, mainly younger people who lived in single family residences, reflecting the area surrounding the court.

According to those interviewed, the tennis court is frequently used during the summer, so that players may be forced to take turns. The users are young, mainly high school age. Some of the interviewees mentioned that they preferred to bicycle to other tennis courts nearby instead because the JD court has a floor which is slippery in light rains, is dirty at times, and consists of the "old fashioned" floor. On the other hand, others mentioned that this kind of a tennis court was especially advantageous since they played in the shadow without the sun in their eyes. When questioned about the noise at the tennis court, everyone stated that that was no problem or that none had complained to them about it. Some were concerned about breathing fumes from motor vehicles, but not to the extent that they would not use the tennis court. No one

seemed interested in having the tennis court enclosed, based on the response that tennis is an outdoor sport; some, however, expressed interest in getting a new surface.

Alternatives and Conclusions

Some differing opinions have been expressed on the feasibility of this site for tennis courts (see EDAW/JJ remarks following Worksheet 4), but on the whole and from the testimony of users and neighbors, this JD proposal seems appropriate and the demand could probably usefully support several more courts (with proper design treatment) if city financing were available. Use of the area for enclosed storage is technically feasible (see EDAW/JJ) but is probably not more attractive than tennis courts, and there is no significant local parking demand in excess of supply. However, the University of Washington (due to the loss of on-campus parking) has recently proposed a 336-stall student parking lot on the subject site, to be served by a shuttle service to the University. This alternative has been considered in Worksheet 4, in part for the purpose of illustrating the use of the worksheet. Both alternatives are shown on a single worksheet, because of the simplicity of this case and for convenience in comparing ratings of the same characteristic for each alternative. Results of the comparison are not conclusive in favor of one or the other alternative, but the worksheet does display the relevant factors and illustrates the desirability of the parking alternative if more tennis courts are not provided. The next step should be a meeting between City, University, and Department of Highways representatives to explore questions such as what other alternatives the City and University have and whether portions of each proposal could be successfully accommodated at the site.

Worksheet 1

JDP PROPOSAL IDENTIFICATION FORM

Short Title RAVENNA BLVD. TENNIS COURTS JDP classification(s) P-1, , .

Proposed Location RAVENNA BLVD. at N.E. 65th Street & 8th Ave., N.E.

Originated By City of Seattle Project No. 7-306
 (Applicant or highway department's originator)

<u>COSPONSORSHIP</u>	<u>DEFINITE</u>	<u>POSSIBLE</u>	<u>AGENCY OR CONTACT</u>
Federal	()	()	
Other State	()	()	
Local (inc. special district)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	()	<u>Dept. of Parks & Recreation</u>
Private	()	()	
Other	()	()	

ACTIONS REQUIRED (check as many as are believed to be applicable)

Planning (physical) coordination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Airspace lease	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Community interaction	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Franchised operator's agreement	()
Design integration	()	Franchise agreement (utility)	()
Construction accommodation	()	Encroachment permit	()
Maintenance or operating agreement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Surplus property sale	()
Land acquisition coordination	()	Development of other state properties (within highway corridor)	()

SPATIAL DESIGNATION (relation of joint element to the highway facility)

Airspace () Groundspace Below-ground () Outside R/W ()

LAND TENURE CLASSIFICATION (joint element as related to highway right of way)

I Within normal R/W	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	III On expanded R/W	()
II On Excess property	()	IV On adjacent public property	()
		V On adjacent private property	()

TIMING DISTINCTION

Permanent joint use Pre-highway construction () Post construction
 Temporary joint use () Concurrent construction ()

See reverse side for information noted for file purposes.

BASIC POLICY ANALYSIS SUMMARY

Question No. and Key Words (Refer to Section 4 for full question and notations)		Yes	No	Not Applicable
(conceptual)				
1	CONCEPT	(S)	()	
2	DEFINITION	(S)	()	
3	JDP TYPE	(S)	()	
4	FEDERAL POLICY	(S)	()	()
5	AUTHORITY	(S)	()	
(operational)				
6	TRAFFIC AND FUNCTION	(S)	()	
7	HEALTH AND SAFETY	(S)	()	
8	LIABILITY	(S)	()	
(community oriented)				
9	GOALS AND OBJECTIVES	(S)	()	
10	LOCAL NEED	()	(S)	
11	NEIGHBORHOOD COMPATIBILITY	(S)	()	
12	LOCATION	()	(S)	
13	ALTERNATE JD USES	()	(S)	
14	LOCAL APPROVAL	(S)	()	()
15	LOCAL APPROVAL (if #14 is negative)	()	()	(S)
16	PUBLIC OPINION	(S)	()	
(cosponsorship)				
17	COSPONSOR AUTHORITY	(S)	()	()
18	COSPONSOR FINANCIAL CAPACITY	()	(S)	
19	DEPARTMENT SPONSORSHIP	()	()	(S)
20	FUTURE COSPONSOR	()	()	(S)
(right-of-way)				
21	ORIGINAL PURPOSE	(S)	()	()
22	PUBLIC USE	()	()	(S)
23	PROPERTY RESTRICTION	(S)	()	
24	EXCESS PROPERTY	()	()	(S)
		()	()	(S)
Total Affirmative		(15)		
Total Negative		(4)		

GENERAL CRITERIA ANALYSIS SUMMARY

JD Project No. 7-306 Completed by SRI Team Date November 1971

<u>Subsection and Criterion Title</u>	<u>Rating*</u>	<u>Comments</u>
5.1 PHYSICAL CONSIDERATIONS		
5.1.1 Future Expansion and Obsolescence		
Expansion options	<u>A</u>	
Obsolescence compatibility	<u>A</u>	
5.1.2 Traffic and Accessibility		
Traffic interference and capacity	<u>A</u>	
Access need	<u>NA</u>	
Access spacing and control	<u>NA</u>	
Ramp capacity when access is direct	<u>NA</u>	
Peak-traffic conflicts	<u>NA</u>	
Local street circulation patterns	<u>NA</u>	
Pedestrian conflicts	<u>A</u>	
5.1.3 Safety and Health		
Safety impairment	<u>A</u>	
Air quality control	<u>Q</u>	<u>Active recreation</u>
Noise levels and sound control	<u>U</u>	
Vibration	<u>NA</u>	
Public health aspects	<u>A</u>	
5.1.4 Structural		
Lateral loads (seismic)	<u>NA</u>	
Highway vehicle impact	<u>NA</u>	
Subsurface load increases	<u>NA</u>	
Excavations and structural integrity	<u>NA</u>	
Highway structure attachments	<u>Q</u>	<u>Check for lighting & rain shield attachments</u>
Falling objects, spillage, side-casting and snow-melt	<u>A</u>	
5.1.5 Aesthetics		
Physical scale	<u>A</u>	
Visual amenity	<u>A</u>	
Building appearance and siting	<u>NA</u>	

* Key to Ratings on page 2 of Worksheet

Worksheet 3 (Continued)

Subsection and Criterion Title	Rating*	Comments
5.1.6 Screening and Fencing		
Visual screening	Q	Check landscaping in regard to high chain-link fences
Object retention or deflection (accidental or intentional)	NA	
Restraint fencing	NA	
5.1.7 Illumination		
Driver safety	NA	
Surveillance and crime	Q	Check need for lighting
Aesthetics	Q	" " " "
5.1.8 Signing		
Demonstration of need	NA	None planned
Design and location	NA	or needed
5.1.9 Utilities		
Location and installation (JD projects)	NA	
Appurtenances ancillary to JD	NA	
Attachment to JD structures	NA	
5.1.10 Clearance		
Minimums by cognizant authority	A	
Special JD considerations	Q	Hwy. structure may be too Low (i.e., noise and illumination problems)
5.1.11 Maintenance		
Impairment to highway element	A	
Impairment to joint element	A	
Hazardous conditions	A	
5.1.12 Construction		
Construction coordination	NA	
Labor relations	NA	
5.1.13 Fire and Associated Protection(explosion)		
Protection of joint element	Q	
Protection of highway element	A	

* Key to Ratings: A = Criterion is adequately met
 Q = Some question exists as to whether the criterion is met
 U = JD performance is unfavorable in relation to criterion
 NA = Criterion not applicable to this project.

Worksheet 3 (Concluded)

<u>Subsection and Criterion Title</u>	<u>Rating*</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<u>5.2 ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS</u>		
5.2.1 Evidence of Demand		
Public uses	<u>Q</u>	<u>First court has good us</u>
Private uses	<u>NA</u>	<u>seven likely to have lo</u> <u>us</u>
5.2.2 Alternative Sites, Uses, or Scales		
Site	<u>A</u>	
Use	<u>Q</u>	<u>Student parking shuttle</u>
Scale	<u>Q</u>	<u>See 5.2.1</u>
5.2.3 Site and Spillover Effects	<u>A</u>	<u>No significant effects</u>
Local government costs and tax revenues		
Property value changes		
Employment		
Employment versus unemployment		
Personal and business income		
Retail sales		
Price quantity changes in low income housing markets		
Relocation of businesses		
Disruption		
5.2.4 Appraised Value Determination	<u>U</u>	
5.2.5 Cosponsor's Financial Capability	<u>U</u>	<u>For 7 courts</u>
<u>5.3 LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS</u>		
5.3.1 Land Use and Neighborhood Compatibility	<u>A</u>	
5.3.2 Qualification as "Public Use"	<u>NA</u>	
5.3.3 Anti-diversion Amendment Prohibition	<u>NA</u>	
5.3.4 Tortious Liability	<u>A</u>	<u>Remote</u>
5.3.5 Sale or Lease Alternatives	<u>A</u>	<u>Lease appropriate</u>
<u>5.4 SOCIAL CONSIDERATIONS</u>		
5.4.1 Community Needs	<u>A</u>	
5.4.2 Neighborhood Social Conditions	<u>A</u>	
5.4.3 Community Identity	<u>Q</u>	<u>May lack neighborhood</u> <u>group response</u>
5.4.4 Family Relocation	<u>NA</u>	

Worksheet 4

COMPARATIVE DISPLAY CHART

An Array of Costs(-) and Benefits(+) Due to a Proposed JDP

JD Project No. 7-306 Completed by SRI Team Date February 1972

1. Tennis Courts (7)
2. University Parking Stalls (336)

Type of Effect (By Interest Group)	Incremental Effects			
	Costable		Quanti- fiable	Quali- tative
	1.	2.	1.	2.
A. HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT				
(Initial costs and benefits)				
Planning, surveys, engineering (-)				
Land acquisition (-)				
Construction (-)	\$ 0	\$ -226,000		
Costs to meet Worksheet 3 criteria(-):				
Lighting			?	-1 -2
Shield between structures			?	-1 0

Relocation payments (-)				
Construction delays (-)				
Sale of land (+)				
Other: _____				

TOTAL INITIAL COSTABLE EFFECTS (NET)	\$ 0	\$ -226,000		
(Annual costs and benefits)				
Utility Service (-)				
Maintenance (- or +) *	\$ +1,000	\$ +1,000		
Lease revenues (+)	\$ 0	\$ 0?		
Community goodwill (- or +)				+2 +1
Other: _____				

TOTAL ANNUAL COSTABLE EFFECTS (NET)	\$ +1,000	\$ +1,000		

* Presumes maintenance would be responsibility of the City or the University of Washington, respectively.

Worksheet 4 (Continued)

<u>Type of Effect (By Interest Group)</u>	<u>Incremental Effects</u>	
	<u>Costable</u>	<u>Quantifiable</u>
		<u>Qualitative</u>
		<u>1. 2.</u>
B. HIGHWAY USERS		
(Annual costs and benefits)		
Effects of any unfavorable Worksheet 3 ratings (-)	-----	-----
-----	-----	-----
Access to joint facility (+)		<u>0 +1</u>
Other: -----	-----	-----
-----	-----	-----
C. JOINT ELEMENT USERS		
(Annual costs and benefits relative to other site locations outside the highway corridor)		
Effects of any unfavorable Worksheet 3 ratings (-)		
<u>Probability of financing</u>	-----	<u>-2 +1</u>
-----	-----	-----
Noise (- or +)	-----	<u>-1 0</u>
Air quality (- or +)	-----	<u>-1 0</u>
Convenience (+)		<u>+1 +2</u>
Economy (+)	-----	-----
Other: <u>Shielded from sun</u>	-----	<u>+1 +1</u>
-----	-----	-----
D. NEIGHBORHOOD		
(Annual costs and benefits)		
Effects of any unfavorable Worksheet 3 ratings (-)	-----	-----
-----	-----	-----
Buffer or connecting effects (+)		-----
Other: <u>Open Space and Aesthetics</u>	-----	<u>+1 -1</u>
-----	-----	-----

Worksheet 4 (Concluded)

<u>Type of Effect (By Interest Group)</u>	<u>Incremental Effects</u>		
	<u>Costable</u>	<u>Quanti- fiable</u>	<u>Quali- tative</u>
			<u>1.</u> <u>2.</u>
E. COMMUNITY			
(Annual costs and benefits)			
Effects of any unfavorable Worksheet 3 ratings (-)			
_____	-----		_____
_____	-----		_____
Local government costs (-)	-----		<u>-1</u> <u>+8</u>
Local tax revenues (+)	_____		<u>0</u> <u>0</u>
Increased property values (+)	-----		<u>0</u> <u>-1</u>
Employment (+)		<u>0</u> <u>4</u> *	<u>0</u> <u>+1</u>
Net personal and business income(+)	-----		_____
Retail sales (+)	-----		_____
Relocation costs in excess of relocation payments (-)	-----		_____
Other: _____	-----	-----	_____
_____	-----	-----	_____

Key

- _____ Indicates most probable entry
- Indicates less probable entry
- (Blank) Indicates entry of low or zero probability

* Estimated number of additional bus driver jobs.

RAVENNA BOULEVARD TENNIS COURTS

The spaces under the freeway along Ravenna Boulevard at NE 65th Street and Oswego Place NE are not well suited to Tennis Courts. The existing court lies beneath the northbound lanes of the freeway adjacent to NE 65th, with the parking extending under the southbound lanes. The freeway is low at that point with closely spaced columns, and a high noise level. It would be extremely difficult to play a game of tennis from the standpoint of noise alone, as one could scarcely hear the ball hit the racket, or be able to carry on any conversation. The existing court apparently has some use by students from the nearby Roosevelt School. With Woodland Park Courts quite close, it seems doubtful that persons from the surrounding area (residential) would be likely to use the Ravenna court to play tennis, when the Woodland Park courts offer far more advantages. The parking space adjacent to the tennis court is being used, possibly by the school or adjacent church, although the school already has a parking lot under the freeway next to the school playground.

The area under the freeway across NE 65th from the tennis court caters to considerable pedestrian traffic generated from Roosevelt School. It would seem advisable to develop the space under the highway adjacent to the school as a pedestrian connector between the residential area and school.

The area proposed for the tennis courts is better suited to storage if enclosed and well landscaped on the exterior. With the noise level being high at this point, it isn't well suited to pedestrian related uses. Parking may be a possibility, however, being adjacent to residential areas it is doubtful that there is a need for extensive additional parking.

The best alternate use appears to be as enclosed storage, under the freeway on the portion that fronts on NE 65th Street. By leaving the columns exposed along the Ravenna Boulevard portion, the driver on Ravenna will have somewhat the same feeling as was originally produced by the trees that were removed to construct the freeway. Additional trees still extend on down Ravenna Boulevard.

Eckbo, Dean, Austin & Williams
Jones & Jones

RAVENNA BOULEVARD TENNIS COURTS

TRAFFIC AND ACCESSIBILITY

Access for this joint development project site is entirely from the local street system. Tennis courts do not attract a great deal of traffic, so this joint development project would not cause congestion on the local streets. At this point, only one court is developed, but the seven ultimately planned would not cause congestion on the local streets. The joint element is easily accessible to pedestrian traffic.

STRUCTURAL

The attachment of light and sound screening between the separate roadway structures, as suggested in the following paragraphs, should be designed in such a manner that the structural integrity of the overpass structures is not affected. This screening should also be of strength suitable to resist penetration of hub caps, etc., or rail elements which may be knocked out due to a collision above.

SCREENING AND FENCING

Light and noise screening should be provided. The space between overpass structures mentioned under illumination also allows a good deal of traffic noise onto the tennis courts. Players have experienced difficulty hearing the ball hit the court and the other player's racket. Some sort of screening could help alleviate both of these problems. Such screening could be placed between the highway overpass structures, and in so doing, could deflect rain off of the court's surface, making it more of an all-weather tennis court.

ILLUMINATION

The joint element is not illuminated, which eliminates the possibility of playing tennis at night. If the area was illuminated, it would be more desirable from a security standpoint, as a possible crime deterrent, at least while it was lit.

The column spacing dictates an east-west orientation of the tennis court. This makes it difficult to play on in the evening when the sun is setting.

Daytime illumination of the tennis courts is rather poor. A light shaft results because of the space between the separate overpass structures. The player sees the ball only while it is in the light shaft, not on his side of the light shaft or the opponents side of the light shaft.

SIGNING

There is no signing contemplated or required for this facility.

CLEARANCE

The existing tennis court is layed out in such a way that there is adequate space between the highway overpass columns to effectively utilize the court. The highway overpass structure is sufficiently high above ground to easily accommodate tennis playing.

MAINTENANCE

The responsibility for maintenance of the joint element lies with the City. Benefit does accrue, therefore, to the Department of Highways, as this area would otherwise require maintenance by the State.

The facility is not very well maintained, possibly because is is not used very much for the reasons mentioned previously. On the other hand, part of the reason the court is not utilized may be because it is not well maintained. Therefore, if playing conditions are improved from the standpoint of illumination and noise control, better maintenance should be provided.

CONSTRUCTION

Since the joint element is to be built (expanded) beneath the existing highway overpasses and the construction is minor in nature, no construction problems exist. If screening devices are installed between the overpass structures, then coordination with the Department of Highways will be required.

FIRE AND ASSOCIATED PROTECTION (EXPLOSION)

The joint element and its use present no hazard to the highway. With the exception of a catastrophic event on the freeway above, no particular hazard exists to the players below. The very low density of utilization to be expected on a facility such as this precludes the use of special safety provisions.

SUMMARY

Apparently, this joint element is not being used because it was improperly planned. Had there been provisions in the application process for adequate planning for the joint element, one of two things might have happened. The City might have been persuaded to properly plan the tennis court to make it attractive to tennis players. If it was not possible to make the tennis court attractive to tennis players, the City might have considered not proceeding with the project.

Some sort of a light barrier placed between the overpass structures in the open space above the existing court would not only solve the light shaft problem but might eliminate some of the noise and would keep the rain off the players. If the noise could be reduced and the court adequately maintained, the court might then be attractive to tennis players.

NORTHSHORE AND SOUTHSHORE VIEW POINT PARKS

General Discussion

This JD proposal is by the City of Seattle, for construction at city expense of two small parks under the Ship Canal Bridge (which is quite high over the subject area) near the University of Washington and on the ship canal shores.

The evaluation team visited the site and interviewed people in the area. There seemed to be overwhelming agreement that the development of parks in that area will do much to serve the community, increase recreational opportunities, and save access to the waterfront for the public. The area is currently in use by students and workmen in the area and development would go far to enhance the desirability of the sites. Residential and University of Washington student access to the Northshore Park is reasonably good for an area with few sidewalks, but parking could be a problem (see EDAW/JJ and RE statements for suggestions regarding parking, illumination, and other matters). Provision of 32 parking spaces is now being proposed across the street from the Northshore park by the Department of Highways for both their use and potential park users.

Alternatives and Conclusions

Alternative private industrial or commercial uses similar to others on the shores of Lake Union and the ship canal are conceivable, but would further limit public access to the waterfront. Since such access is already severely limited, the proposed JDP seems highly desirable and should, in our opinion, be approved. It could also be argued that even greater access for the parks should be provided in the form of boat landings and/or docks, but the traffic congestion and noise created by such uses would conflict with park use for the small sites involved. Either passive parks or docks, but not both, are believed feasible, and it is our impression that there is more demand at the present for park use as proposed.

JDP PROPOSAL IDENTIFICATION FORM

Short Title Northshore and Southshore View Point Parks JDP classification(s) P-2, , .

Proposed Location Lake Washington Ship Canal Bridge

Originated By City of Seattle Project No. 7-1003
 (Applicant or highway department's originator)

<u>COSPONSORSHIP</u>	<u>DEFINITE</u>	<u>POSSIBLE</u>	<u>AGENCY OR CONTACT</u>
Federal	()	()	_____
Other State	()	()	_____
Local (inc. special district)	(✓)	()	<u>Dept. of Parks and Recreation</u>
Private	()	()	_____
Other	()	()	_____

ACTIONS REQUIRED (check as many as are believed to be applicable)

Planning (physical) coordination	(✓)	Airspace lease	(✓)
Community interaction	(✓)	Franchised operator's agreement	()
Design integration	()	Franchise agreement (utility)	()
Construction accommodation	()	Encroachment permit	()
Maintenance or operating agreement	(✓)	Surplus property sale/lease	(✓) <i>Southshore only</i>
Land acquisition coordination	()	Development of other state properties (within highway corridor)	()

SPATIAL DESIGNATION (relation of joint element to the highway facility)

Airspace () Groundspace (✓) Below-ground () Outside R/W (✓)

LAND TENURE CLASSIFICATION (joint element as related to highway right of way)

I Within normal R/W	(✓)	III On expanded R/W	()
II On Excess property	(✓)	IV On adjacent public property	(✓)
		V On adjacent private property	()

TIMING DISTINCTION

Permanent joint use (✓) Pre-highway construction () Post construction (✓)
 Temporary joint use () Concurrent construction ()

See reverse side for information noted for file purposes.

BASIC POLICY ANALYSIS SUMMARY

Project No. 7-1003

Question No. and Key Words (Refer to <u>Section 4 for full question and notations</u>)		Yes	No	Not Applicable
(conceptual)				
1	CONCEPT	(✓)	()	
2	DEFINITION	(✓)	()	
3	JDP TYPE	(✓)	()	
4	FEDERAL POLICY	(✓)	()	()
5	AUTHORITY	(✓)	()	
(operational)				
6	TRAFFIC AND FUNCTION	North (✓)	(✓) South	
7	HEALTH AND SAFETY	()	(✓)	
8	LIABILITY	()	(✓)	
(community oriented)				
9	GOALS AND OBJECTIVES	(✓)	()	
10	LOCAL NEED	(✓)	()	
11	NEIGHBORHOOD COMPATIBILITY	South (✓)	(✓) North	
12	LOCATION	South (✓)	(✓) North	
13	ALTERNATE JD USES	(✓)	()	
14	LOCAL APPROVAL	(✓)	()	()
15	LOCAL APPROVAL (if #14 is negative)	()	()	(✓)
16	PUBLIC OPINION	(✓)	()	
(cosponsorship)				
17	COSPONSOR AUTHORITY	(✓)	()	()
18	COSPONSOR FINANCIAL CAPACITY	(✓)	()	
19	DEPARTMENT SPONSORSHIP	()	()	(✓)
20	FUTURE COSPONSOR	()	()	(✓)
(right-of-way)				
21	ORIGINAL PURPOSE	(✓)	()	()
22	PUBLIC USE	()	()	(✓)
23	PROPERTY RESTRICTION	South (✓)	(✓) North *	
24	EXCESS PROPERTY	(✓)	()	()
Total Affirmative (18)				
Total Negative		(6)		

* Off right of way portion on easterly portion of Northshore View Point Park.

GENERAL CRITERIA ANALYSIS SUMMARY

JD Project No. <u>7-1003</u> Completed by <u>SRI Team</u>		Date <u>Nov. 1971</u>
<u>Subsection and Criterion Title</u>	<u>Rating*</u>	<u>Comments</u>
5.1 PHYSICAL CONSIDERATIONS		
5.1.1 Future Expansion and Obsolescence		
Expansion options	<u>A</u>	
Obsolescence compatibility	<u>A</u>	
5.1.2 Traffic and Accessibility		
Traffic interference and capacity	<u>Q</u>	<u>"Southshore"-Local streets</u>
Access need	<u>NA</u>	
Access spacing and control	<u>NA</u>	
Ramp capacity when access is direct	<u>NA</u>	
Peak-traffic conflicts	<u>A</u>	
Local street circulation patterns	<u>U</u>	<u>Southshore-Fuhrman & Fairvic</u>
Pedestrian conflicts	<u>A</u>	<u>Ave's may be a problem</u>
5.1.3 Safety and Health		
Safety impairment	<u>A</u>	
Air quality control	<u>A</u>	
Noise levels and sound control	<u>A</u>	
Vibration	<u>NA</u>	
Public health aspects	<u>Q</u>	<u>Vector control (rip-rap</u> <u>area)</u>
5.1.4 Structural		
Lateral loads (seismic)	<u>NA</u>	
Highway vehicle impact	<u>NA</u>	
Subsurface load increases	<u>NA</u>	
Excavations and structural integrity	<u>NA</u>	
Highway structure attachments	<u>NA</u>	
Falling objects, spillage, side-casting and snow-melt	<u>Q</u>	<u>See 5.1.11, Maintenance</u>
5.1.5 Aesthetics		
Physical scale	<u>A</u>	
Visual amenity	<u>A</u>	
Building appearance and siting	<u>NA</u>	

* Key to Ratings on page 2 of Worksheet

Worksheet 3 (Continued)

Subsection and Criterion Title	Rating*	Comments
5.1.6 Screening and Fencing		
Visual screening	Q	Northshore Park
Object retention or deflection (accidental or intentional)	A	
Restraint fencing	Q	Young children at water edge
5.1.7 Illumination		
Driver safety	NA	
Surveillance and crime	Q	
Aesthetics	Q	Check plans
5.1.8 Signing		
Demonstration of need	A	Not required
Design and location	NA	
5.1.9 Utilities		
Location and installation (JD projects)	NA	
Appurtenances ancillary to JD	NA	
Attachment to JD structures	NA	
5.1.10 Clearance		
Minimums by cognizant authority	A	
Special JD considerations	A	
5.1.11 Maintenance		
Impairment to highway element	Q	Paint spill; and storm drain outfall line
Impairment to joint element	A	
Hazardous conditions	A	
5.1.12 Construction		
Construction coordination	NA	
Labor relations	NA	
5.1.13 Fire and Associated Protection(explosion)		
Protection of joint element	A	
Protection of highway element	A	

Key to Ratings: A = Criterion is adequately met
Q = Some question exists as to whether the criterion is met
U = JD performance is unfavorable in relation to criterion
NA = Criterion not applicable to this project.

Worksheet 3 (Concluded)

Subsection and Criterion Title	Rating*	Comments
<u>5.2 ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS</u>		
5.2.1 Evidence of Demand		
Public uses	A	
Private uses	NA	
5.2.2 Alternative Sites, Uses, or Scales		
Site	A	
Use	A	
Scale	A	
5.2.3 Site and Spillover Effects		
Local government costs and tax revenues	A	No significant effects
Property value changes		
Employment		
Employment versus unemployment		
Personal and business income		
Retail sales		
Price quantity changes in low income housing markets		
Relocation of businesses		
Disruption		
5.2.4 Appraised Value Determination		
5.2.5 Cosponsor's Financial Capability		
<u>5.3 LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS</u>		
5.3.1 Land Use and Neighborhood Compatibility		
5.3.2 Qualification as "Public Use"		
5.3.3 Anti-diversion Amendment Prohibition		
5.3.4 Tortious Liability		
5.3.5 Sale or Lease Alternatives		
<u>5.4 SOCIAL CONSIDERATIONS</u>		
5.4.1 Community Needs		
5.4.2 Neighborhood Social Conditions		
5.4.3 Community Identity		
5.4.4 Family Relocation		

NORTHSHORE AND SOUTHSHORE VIEW POINT PARKS

The Northshore and Southshore parks would be pedestrian related uses with no relationship to the freeway user. They lie beneath the freeway at one of its highest points, consequently the spatial proximity and noise factors are minimized. The proposed park use (passive) is part of the overall park and view corridor system outlined in the "Lake Union Preliminary Comprehensive Plan and Action Program". If this plan is implemented, the parks would be connected to Myrtle Edwards Park, the South Park, and street-end corridors via a pedestrian and bicycle path. The Northshore park would develop a presently unused space in an area of mixed waterfront use. The Northshore Park's special appeal is due to its particularly interesting view of the city. This amenity is enhanced at night when the city's lights provide a spectacular view. Investigation of a connector with the railroad line now used as a pedestrian path, and with the "mini-park" being developed adjacent to Ivar's Salmon House might be made, however, the Northshore park's main function will be as a viewpoint.

The Southshore park is already used essentially as a park by the adjacent residential area, and during the warmer months by "luncheaters". It offers an advantageous view of the boat traffic and offers the amenities needed for a pleasant "sitting spot". The adjacent yacht club and boat moorages have created considerable parking congestion in the limited size lots off the road. The proposed parking lot for Tyee Yacht Club would relieve some of this congestion, and with proper landscaping would not detract from the area. Much of Southshore Park's value lies as part of the overall park and open space development around Lake Union.

The connector with the minipark south of Eastlake and the Southshore park is questionable in value. The referred to mini-park is a small triangular section fronted by streets on three sides. Its only use appears to be by pedestrians waiting for the bus (there are busstops on both Eastlake Avenue East and Harvard Avenue East), and occasionally as an overflow parking lot for the taverns on Eastlake and Fuhrman. The only value in a connector would be as an outgrowth of the pedestrian/bicycle path around Lake Union - in which case a connector to Capitol Hill via the mini-park may be advisable.

The Northshore and Southshore parks each optimize the amenities of their respective sites. They are natural choices for the sites (as is indicated by the existing "park function" of the Southshore Park site) and it is doubtful that any alternate use could utilize the site as well.

Eckbo, Dean, Austin & Williams
Jones & Jones

NORTH SHORE AND SOUTH SHORE VIEWPOINT MINI-PARKS

TRAFFIC AND ACCESSIBILITY

Access from the highway element is not a consideration for this joint development project, since they are below the high level bridge.

According to plans prepared by the City, which are not too far along, users may enter the south shore park from Eastlake via Allison and Fairview, or Fuhrman Avenue. The Allison-Fairview route passes the proposed Tyee Yacht Club's 64-car lot and will provide access for that parking lot. This arrangement might cause congestion at the intersections with Eastlake Avenue, except for the fact that there will be very few cars involved. Presumably, some of the park users will arrive on foot and by bicycle from the area around the University, although students from the University would be more likely to use the north shore park.

Access to the north shore park, also local in nature, has even less impact on the surrounding traffic pattern than does the south shore park. This is for several reasons. First, the north shore park accommodates fewer automobiles. Secondly, it has a greater attraction for students and others arriving by foot and bicycle because it is closer to the University area. Last, NE Northlake Way, from which people enter this park, is not as heavily traveled as Eastlake to the south.

STRUCTURAL

Due to the physical separation between the two elements of this proposal and the nature of the joint element, there are no structural concerns that affect the highway element.

REDFORD ENGINEERS

SCREENING AND FENCING

Physical screening from the highway element is not anticipated for either the north shore or south shore park.

Screening, as a part of the landscape design of the park, probably will be and should be considered, particularly between the park site and the industrial area to the east and west of the north shore park.

ILLUMINATION

There is no relationship between the highway illumination and illumination, if any, for the parks. They do not detract from or complement each other. The comments under "Clearance" regarding the extreme height of the bridge structure over the parks are applicable here. The bridge structure detracts very little from the natural daytime illumination of the park sites. The bridge runs north and south so that the parks will be in the shade only when the sun is directly overhead. This would probably be quite pleasant on a hot summer day. On the other hand, the sites are not unpleasantly dark as they would be under a similar structure 20 or 30 feet overhead.

The City's intention to illuminate the park is not clear at this time. If they were to light the park, it would probably be for security purposes only. Both parks are somewhat isolated -- the south shore parking being considerably downhill from Eastlake and the north shore park on a low volume street. Nighttime illumination would certainly be desirable for security.

SIGNING

Signs on the highway directing motorists to these city parks are not intended or required.

Signs on the local streets leading to either park site may or may not be installed by the City. On one hand, they may be desirable to direct motorists to the park sites. On the other hand, these are neighborhood

type mini-parks and may only attract those users who already know where they are. Park users arriving by foot, and possibly by bicycle, can probably be assumed to know where the park is prior to starting the trip. For this reason, signs would be less warranted than for a similar park used entirely by motorists and as such are not required.

CLEARANCE

Clearance considerations for both the north and south shore parks are somewhat similar. The Lake Union Bridge, passing high overhead, gives one the feeling of being out in the open as opposed to undercover. This provides excellent separation visually from the highway element. Although protection from the elements is not provided as it would be for a lower overpass structure, the feeling of being out from under is most appropriate for a park.

MAINTENANCE

The City of Seattle will maintain both of these parks. This is a positive effect to the State Highway Department because it relieves them of the responsibility of maintaining these areas.

Maintenance by the State Highway Department of the bridge overhead may present a problem to the park below. The bridge, being steel, requires regular spray painting. During the process, paint falls on anything below. The City will have to coordinate with the State maintenance crews to keep people and vehicles out from under the bridge during painting operations. As far as other items are concerned, such as benches, picnic tables, paving, and shrubbery, the City can either make them removable or protect them during the painting operation.

CONSTRUCTION

Since the freeway structure exists and the contemplated construction is minor in nature, no particular construction problems exist with this proposal.

FIRE AND ASSOCIATED PROTECTION (EXPLOSION)

Fire or explosion on the bridge would be contained on the bridge unless of course, it destroyed the bridge. This makes the users of the park extremely safe from other than catastrophic events on the bridge.

The type of fire normally associated with a park, that is, a burning automobile or possibly a fire set by vandals, would have no effect on the bridge structure. This is because the bridge is so very high above the park grade. It is safe to say that neither element would be a fire hazard to the other.

SUMMARY

The City of Seattle apparently has funds available from another governmental agency to develop both of these parks. This should mean that development will not be held up for lack of funds.

Regarding the north shore park, there is some question as to whether the City can actually utilize that portion of Pasadena Place NE lying west of its center line. Although this property is not within the highway right-of-way, the Department of Highways should be assured that the joint sponsor, in this case the City, will be able to develop all the land within the project.

The two elements of this joint development project have little or no impact on each other. The highway user traveling over the bridge structure high overhead is not even aware of the park or any other activity below. The user of the park is hardly aware of the structure high above his head except for the slight noise from the traveled way above.

The park designer will have practically as much freedom in his approach to the design as he would were this site completely unrelated to the highway, except for the presence of the two massive bridge columns at each park site.

All this emphasizes the ease with which space beneath overpass structures can be developed, and the fact that the higher the structure the more the area below resembles open space.

PARK PLAZA

(Including East Plaza Parking Facility)

General Discussion

This JD proposal has three main elements: the Park Place office building (including a 270-car garage) on the west side of the freeway, constructed in part on excess freeway right-of-way; a large pedestrian bridge topped by a park over the freeway between University and Seneca Streets; and a 585-space parking garage (East Plaza Parking Facility) on the east side of the freeway, connected by the park to the west side.

The proposal has for some time been widely acclaimed in the press for reconnecting Capitol Hill, an integral part of the City east of the freeway at this point, to Seattle's CBD, in an aesthetic manner that provides an attractive park in the freeway airspace. To test public opinion directly, we stationed an interviewer on one of the streets now crossing the freeway at this point with a picture of the model for the development. People passing by were asked what opinion they had of the model. Only one out of six interviewees felt that it was an undesirable plan, since he wanted to have it all be a park rather than shared with a building. The other five felt that it was a very good plan, generally confirming that the area needed a park, especially since the residents in the apartments on Capitol Hill were older people. Most interviewees believed that the development would reduce freeway noise levels which would make the apartments more desirable to live in.

Alternatives and Conclusions

We can conceive of no feasible alternative to the Park Plaza proposal that would further improve its obvious appeal, although the EDAW/JJ and RE statements do raise some incidental design issues. The relatively modest

capacity of the East Plaza Parking Facility in relation to its cost was explored, but some difficult site and design problems have both limited its capacity and increased its cost beyond original plans. This is unfortunate, because the recent downtown parking study (by Victor O. Gray and Company, for the Seattle Parking Commission) and preliminary parking planning for the city both support the need for more parking of this type at the CBD fringes and near freeway on-and-off ramps.

In future joint developments of such a large scale, it would probably be helpful to hold public hearings, conduct more interviews, have a group of professional people and community leaders evaluate the proposals at an early stage, and observe similar developments to see how much they are used. The planning for this development has been more informal, though it is now monitored by the city's Design Commission and evidences extremely imaginative design concepts and high standards of quality and safety.

A proposal had once been made for burying the entire section of I-5 through Central Seattle. The enthusiasm which the present proposal engenders supports the desirability of considering such possibilities in future freeway planning in urban core areas.

Worksheet 1

JDP PROPOSAL IDENTIFICATION FORM

Short Title Park Plaza (includes East Plaza Parking Facility) JDP classification(s) B-1, P-2, B-6
 Proposed Location University Street, between 6th and 9th Ave's.
 Originated By R. C. Hedreen Project No. 7-633
 (Applicant or highway department's originator) (& 7-1002)

<u>COSPONSORSHIP</u>	<u>DEFINITE</u>	<u>POSSIBLE</u>	<u>AGENCY OR CONTACT</u>
Federal	()	()	
Other State	()	()	
Local (inc. special district)	(✓)	()	<u>Seattle Dept. of Parks & Rec.</u>
Private	(✓)	()	<u>Hedreen (Seattle First Nat. Bank)</u>
Other	()	()	

ACTIONS REQUIRED (check as many as are believed to be applicable)

Planning (physical) coordination	(✓)	Airspace lease	(✓)
Community interaction	(✓)	Franchised operator's agreement	()
Design integration	(✓)	Franchise agreement (utility)	()
Construction accommodation	(✓)	Encroachment permit	()
Maintenance or operating agreement	(✓)	Surplus property sale /lease	(✓)
Land acquisition coordination	()	Development of other state properties (within highway corridor)	()

SPATIAL DESIGNATION (relation of joint element to the highway facility)

Airspace (✓) Groundspace (✓) Below-ground () Outside R/W (✓)

LAND TENURE CLASSIFICATION (joint element as related to highway right of way)

I Within normal R/W	(✓)	III On expanded R/W	()
II On Excess property	(✓)	IV On adjacent public property	(✓)
		V On adjacent private property	(✓)

TIMING DISTINCTION

Permanent joint use (✓) Pre-highway construction () Post construction (✓)
 Temporary joint use () Concurrent construction ()

See reverse side for information noted for file purposes.

BASIC POLICY ANALYSIS SUMMARY

Project No. 7-633

(& 7-1002)

Question No. and Key Words (Refer to Section 4 for full question and notations)		Yes	No	Not Applicable
(conceptual)				
1	CONCEPT	(✓)	()	
2	DEFINITION	(✓)	()	
3	JDP TYPE	(✓)	()	
4	FEDERAL POLICY	(✓)	()	()
5	AUTHORITY	(✓)	()	
(operational)				
6	TRAFFIC AND FUNCTION	()	(✓)	
7	HEALTH AND SAFETY	(✓)	()	
8	LIABILITY	()	(✓)	
(community oriented)				
9	GOALS AND OBJECTIVES	(✓)	()	
10	LOCAL NEED	part (✓)	(✓)	offices
11	NEIGHBORHOOD COMPATIBILITY	(✓)	()	
12	LOCATION	(✓)	()	
13	ALTERNATE JD USES	(✓)	()	
14	LOCAL APPROVAL	(✓)	()	()
15	LOCAL APPROVAL (if #14 is negative)	()	()	(✓)
16	PUBLIC OPINION	()	(✓)	
(cosponsorship)				
17	COSPONSOR AUTHORITY	(✓)	()	()
18	COSPONSOR FINANCIAL CAPACITY	offices (✓)	(✓)	garage
19	DEPARTMENT SPONSORSHIP	()	()	(✓)
20	FUTURE COSPONSOR	()	()	(✓)
(right-of-way)				
21	ORIGINAL PURPOSE	(✓)	()	()
22	PUBLIC USE	()	()	(✓)
23	PROPERTY RESTRICTION	(✓)	()	
24	EXCESS PROPERTY	(✓)	()	()
Total Affirmative(17)				
Total Negative			(5)	

GENERAL CRITERIA ANALYSIS SUMMARY

JD Project No. 7-633 Completed by SRI Team Date November 1971
7-1002

<u>Subsection and Criterion Title</u>	<u>Rating*</u>	<u>Comments</u>
5.1 PHYSICAL CONSIDERATIONS		
5.1.1 Future Expansion and Obsolescence		
Expansion options	<u>A</u>	
Obsolescence compatibility	<u>A</u>	
5.1.2 Traffic and Accessibility		
Traffic interference and capacity	<u>Q</u>	<u>Local streets</u>
Access need	<u>U</u>	<u>Need can be demonstrated but physically impossible</u>
Access spacing and control	<u>NA</u>	
Ramp capacity when access is direct	<u>NA</u>	
Peak-traffic conflicts	<u>NA</u>	<u>i.e., 17 or 18 stories of offices</u>
Local street circulation patterns	<u>Q</u>	
Pedestrian conflicts	<u>A</u>	
5.1.3 Safety and Health		
Safety impairment	<u>Q</u>	<u>Is waterfall in median an "attractive nuisance"</u>
Air quality control	<u>Q</u>	<u>Park element</u>
Noise levels and sound control	<u>A</u>	
Vibration	<u>A</u>	
Public health aspects	<u>A</u>	
5.1.4 Structural		
Lateral loads (seismic)	<u>A</u>	
Highway vehicle impact	<u>A</u>	
Subsurface load increases	<u>A</u>	
Excavations and structural integrity	<u>A</u>	
Highway structure attachments	<u>NA</u>	
Falling objects, spillage, side-casting and snow-melt	<u>A</u>	
5.1.5 Aesthetics		
Physical scale	<u>A</u>	
Visual amenity	<u>A</u>	
Building appearance and siting	<u>A</u>	

* Key to Ratings on page 2 of Worksheet

Worksheet 3 (Continued)

<u>Subsection and Criterion Title</u>	<u>Rating*</u>	<u>Comments</u>
5.1.6 Screening and Fencing		
Visual screening	<u>A</u>	
Object retention or deflection (accidental or intentional)	<u>Q</u>	<u>Over 9th Ave. only</u>
Restraint fencing	<u>NA</u>	
5.1.7 Illumination		
Driver safety	<u>A</u>	<u>Considering its particular location</u>
Surveillance and crime	<u>A</u>	
Aesthetics	<u>Q</u>	<u>Check final plans</u>
5.1.8 Signing		
Demonstration of need	<u>Q</u>	<u>Check signing for</u>
Design and location	<u>Q</u>	<u>East Plaza garage</u>
5.1.9 Utilities		
Location and installation (JD projects)	<u>NA</u>	
Appurtenances ancillary to JD	<u>Q</u>	<u>Check waterfall design</u>
Attachment to JD structures	<u>NA</u>	
5.1.10 Clearance		
Minimums by cognizant authority	<u>A</u>	
Special JD considerations	<u>A</u>	<u>When compared to existing geometrics along I-5</u>
5.1.11 Maintenance		
Impairment to highway element	<u>A</u>	
Impairment to joint element	<u>Q</u>	<u>Waterfall vs. traffic</u>
Hazardous conditions	<u>Q</u>	<u>Waterfall in median</u>
5.1.12 Construction		
Construction coordination	<u>Q</u>	<u>Work over traveled way and in median</u>
Labor relations	<u>NA</u>	
5.1.13 Fire and Associated Protection(explosion)		
Protection of joint element	<u>A</u>	
Protection of highway element	<u>Q</u>	<u>Fire fighting in "tunnel"</u>

<p>* Key to Ratings: A = Criterion is adequately met Q = Some question exists as to whether the criterion is met U = JD performance is unfavorable in relation to criterion NA = Criterion not applicable to this project.</p>

Worksheet 3 (Concluded)

<u>Subsection and Criterion Title</u>	<u>Rating*</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<u>5.2 ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS</u>		
5.2.1 Evidence of Demand		
Public uses	A	
Private uses	A	
5.2.2 Alternative Sites, Uses, or Scales		
Site	A	
Use	A	
Scale	A	
5.2.3 Site and Spillover Effects		
Local government costs and tax revenues	Q	East Plaza garage is expensive in relation to vehicle spaces
Property value changes	A	
Employment	A	
Employment versus unemployment	A	
Personal and business income	A	
Retail sales	A	
Price quantity changes in low income housing markets	NA	
Relocation of businesses	NA	
Disruption	Q	But not considered serio
5.2.4 Appraised Value Determination	A	
5.2.5 Cosponsor's Financial Capability	A	
<u>5.3 LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS</u>		
5.3.1 Land Use and Neighborhood Compatibility	A	
5.3.2 Qualification as "Public Use"	NA	
5.3.3 Anti-diversion Amendment Prohibition	A	Pedestrian overcrossing aspects
5.3.4 Tortious Liability	Q	
5.3.5 Sale or Lease Alternatives	Q	Relates to parking gara portion of JDP
<u>5.4 SOCIAL CONSIDERATIONS</u>		
5.4.1 Community Needs	A	
5.4.2 Neighborhood Social Conditions	A	
5.4.3 Community Identity	Q	Minimal community involvement
5.4.4 Family Relocation	NA	

PARK PLAZA (INCLUDING EAST PLAZA PARKING FACILITY)

The Park Plaza project has the greatest potential for changing the freeway environment of any of the proposed joint uses. The project will, however, create effects that, according to the SRI criteria, are preferably avoided. The freeway crossing will have a "tunnel" effect of the freeway user, although the related problems of lighting, fumes etc. should be workable if given proper consideration. Also the proposed waterfall backed by a glass wall visible to the northbound freeway user will undoubtedly have a distracting visual effect on the driver. Traveling at 50 mph, the driver's cone of vision is about 50°, and his foreground vision is at approximately 100 feet. Therefore, it is possible that he would not see the waterfall until the last moment - at which time he would divert his attention to catch a glimpse of it, creating a safety hazard. It is conceivable, however, that the waterfall could serve in another capacity. Since Seattle has a relatively small business district in proportion to the size of the city with few landmarks visible from the freeway, the city core is easily missed by the freeway user who is unfamiliar with the area. As was previously mentioned, a "sense of space" or means of orientation is essential to the freeway user, and it is possible that the waterfall could serve in a "landmark" capacity, compensating for the tunnel created by the park, and for the limited view of the city.

In other words, the freeway park has the capability of creating a totally new freeway environment for the city. Its effects would be felt in the downtown area, Capitol Hill, and the freeway. As the waterfall could signify a landmark for the driver, the park itself could create a new focal point or landmark for the city. By creating a place with its own visual amenities and sounds, the park will provide a needed function as a pedestrian connector between Capitol Hill and the downtown business area. Pedestrian traffic will be generated from the parking garage, Park Towers, and the surrounding apartments, hospitals, clinics and related services. At present, the pedestrian has the choice of only several overpasses, none of which are oriented to the pedestrian. The Capitol Hill area above the Park Plaza project is comprised primarily of apartments, hospitals and clinics which are plagued by the parking shortage in the area, and would probably make use of the parking facility.

There are possibly alternate choices within the Park Plaza concept itself, such as a different scheme of offices, parking or apartments; but the basic concept of spanning the freeway with a pedestrian connector is necessary to the proposal and a positive addition to the urban form and processes of the city.

Eckbo, Dean, Austin & Williams
Jones & Jones

PARK PLAZA (INCLUDING EAST PLAZA PARKING FACILITY)

TRAFFIC AND ACCESSIBILITY

The parking garage portion of this joint development has a qualitative access need. A considerable number of the users of the parking garage will probably be coming along I-5 from the north and south. Access to the joint element would alleviate traffic congestion on adjacent streets without seriously depreciating the level of service on the highway. This assumes that the users of the parking garage would park somewhere else if the parking garage were not available. This "somewhere else" would probably be in one of the many downtown parking garages already existing.

The parking garage should attract people who work in the downtown area. This is because of the direct and rather pleasant walk from the parking garage through the park and into the central business district. People might be inclined to walk through a park when they would not be inclined to walk the same distance over a bridge. Therefore, the conclusion might be drawn that people would park in this parking garage east of the freeway and walk into town, whereas they might not park on the east side of the freeway and walk over one of the overpass structures into downtown.

The established design criteria for the particular functional classification of the highway indicates that there is insufficient longitudinal space for another access to the highway; therefore, no direct access will be provided. Access to the parking garage will be from the city streets east of the highway. This will still alleviate traffic congestion in the central business district of Seattle west of the highway because vehicles destined for the garage will get to the east side of the highway as quickly as possible after exiting from the highway.

The parking garage's impact on the surrounding city streets has been considered in great depth. An initial feasibility report by a private consultant for the City of Seattle covered demand for parking in the area, ingress and egress to the site, and the garage's impact on the city street network. There has been continuing review by all parties with reports filed with the City; i.e., the Parking Commission and the Traffic Engineer. The project has been reviewed twice by the City Council. This parking garage is part of an overall study of downtown parking for the City of Seattle. The conclusion is that the joint development project's impact on the surrounding streets has been thoroughly investigated and is acceptable to the City of Seattle.

STRUCTURAL

The park structure is, as it should be, designed to lateral design loads found in the Uniform Building Code.

The overpass structure and its supports are being designed so that the supporting members will be immune to damage from vehicles.

The office building west of I-5 was designed for greater earthquake resistance than required by the Seattle Building Code. It approaches the requirements of the Uniform Building Code which, being a more uniformly accepted building code, might be considered more appropriate for joint element buildings.

The park over the highway is designed to prevent people from dropping objects onto the traveled way below. The view ports looking down on the frontage road to the east, however, are not so protected, with only a bridge type handrail. A bridge type handrail is adequate to keep pedestrians from falling down onto the roadway below; but in the case of view ports, they may not be adequate because people may tend to loiter around them with the possibility of soft drink bottles, purses, glasses, and the like accidentally falling to the traveled way below. The City should be encouraged to consider some other type of protection.

SCREENING AND FENCING

Screening along the edge of the overpass structure for the park has been provided in the form of plantings. This is just an extension of the park landscaping and is certainly in keeping with the character and use of the park. It is presumed that a suitable positive restraint is to be utilized in addition to the landscaping to prevent park users from falling to the roadway below.

View ports in the park structure looking down on the 9th Avenue frontage road are protected only by overpass type handrails. This frontage road, while not a part of the highway system, should, nevertheless, be protected against items such as falling bottles.

ILLUMINATION

Illumination for the joint elements; i.e., the parking structure and the elevated park, has not been finalized. The parking garage is being designed by a consulting architect, and the park is being designed by a landscape architect. The Design Commission will review this portion of the project.

Although illumination of the joint elements can be assumed to be satisfactory for those joint elements, the effect of the joint element's illumination on the highway user should be considered. The landscape architect indicates plans for planted screens along the edges of the overpass structure. These plantings should tend to keep the park lighting from being distracting to the motorists below. Even if the park lighting is visible to motorists, it is questionable that it would be distracting. This is because the motorist traveling through that section of highway has become accustomed to overpass structures coming into view, high walls rising and falling on either side, and city lights of all kinds.

SIGNING

Current practice in the State of Washington dictates that this type of development does not warrant a guide sign on a limited access facility. The issue of whether a sign is warranted for this particular joint development site is, of course, another question. It is this writer's opinion that in some cases major generators do warrant guide signs on the highway element. If signing were warranted, the question of whether a sign can be located properly should be carefully considered. This particular section of Interstate-5 is rather busy, and additional distractions should be avoided if at all possible in this area. Therefore, from a practical standpoint, it is considered undesirable to put a sign for a joint development project at this location.

CLEARANCE

The joint elements of this facility are being designed to provide clearances at least commensurate with those existing on this section of I-5. Due to the abundance of walls, structures, ramps, etc., along this section of I-5, the proposed development should not produce any particular uneasiness or startle effect on the driver.

MAINTENANCE

With the exception of additional illumination maintenance, maintenance of the highway is made no more difficult by the presence of the joint development. On the other hand, the joint element cannot be considered a plus to the highway, as far as maintenance is concerned, because the joint sponsor is not maintaining any area that would otherwise have to be maintained by the Department of Highways.

Each of the joint elements will be maintained by its own sponsor. The City of Seattle will maintain the parking garage and the park. The park is part of the City park system and will be maintained as such. The owner of the office building will maintain his building and pay for the maintenance of the portion of the park on his property. This might be considered as a plus for the City, because a portion of the office building owner's property is an extension of the City park maintained by the City Park Department.

The only portion of the joint element which could conceivably create a maintenance problem is the pump house for the waterfall between the north and southbound lanes of the highway. This pump house is tentatively located on grade in the median strip between lanes. Access for pump maintenance should be from the park above to prevent the necessity of entrance at grade from the roadway.

CONSTRUCTION

Construction of the park overpass structure, with its structural supports and the waterfall's pump house in the highway median strip, will cause inconvenience to the highway users. Construction scheduling and procedures will have to be coordinated and contract specifications must be properly set forth to minimize the interference with traffic during construction.

This test case, more than any other, presents an interesting study in the allocation of additional costs of design and construction. These additional costs are not always borne by the element incurring or benefiting by the additional costs. Considering the entire complex, the office building is private capital, the park and parking garage are City financed, and the park support structure over the highway is financed with highway funds.

The park, with its supporting structure, is more expensive than the same park without a supporting structure. The parking garage is more expensive because of the park on its roof, due to additional structure, elevators, ventilation, etc.

Due to the park support structure, the immediate section of highway can be considered to be unusually expensive. Yet, the complex as a whole will provide a park virtually in the center of the city of a size that would be unlikely to be achieved in any other way.

FIRE AND ASSOCIATED PROTECTION (EXPLOSION)

The park portion of this joint development project spanning over the highway is the portion of the joint element which would be affected by or affect the highway as far as potential fire and explosion are concerned. The likelihood of fire or explosion of a magnitude that would be dangerous to the highway or its users occurring on the park structure is remote. The only combustible material within the park structure would be minor items, such as benches and plantings. In addition to that, the overpass structure forms a massive concrete shield between the park above and the highway below. The only conceivable hazard to the highway would be the plantings along the north and south edge of the park over the freeway. These plantings could conceivably burn and drop small pieces of burning matter down onto the highway below. This problem could be alleviated by assuring that the plantings receive adequate water.

Fire or explosion on the highway of sufficient intensity to endanger the users of the park above would indeed be a catastrophic event. A fire on the highway below, such as might be caused by a gasoline truck spilling its contents and burning, would probably not endanger park users because they would have sufficient time to leave the park. Such a fire is a great hazard to the highway user, and a block long section of covered, depressed highway would be a difficult place in which to fight a fire. This same issue could be raised, and should be similarly considered, for a tunnel. Access to the joint element for fire fighters would be from surrounding city streets.

SUMMARY

As of this point in time, sufficient information to obtain a lease agreement has been received by the Department of Highways, although the park and parking garage are still in the design phase. In this very common instance, one of the co-sponsors is the local governing agency. The rather informal arrangement of the Department of Highways giving an indication of probable acceptability based on rather preliminary information from the joint sponsor has worked out quite well.

Funding for the various joint elements has been considered by their respective sponsors. Federal funds will be used for the park support structure. Forward Thrust bonds will provide money for the park. Councilmanic bonds will be issued to provide funds for the garage. The office building is privately financed and is near completion.

The park plaza joint development is an excellent example of what can be done to create a more pleasant metropolitan environment by joint development through the cooperation of the Department of Highways, the City, and a private sponsor.

The parking garage element, aside from its participation in the joint development project, is an example of a necessary structure becoming a very desirable addition to the community through its own joint development. Specifically, the joint development of the parking garage element on the one hand and the view park on the other hand is an excellent combination with or without the highway element.

The park portion of the joint development project over the highway appears to be an excellent use of air rights. First of all, there just isn't that much land available in the central business district for parks. Secondly, the air rights joint development in conjunction with the previously mentioned combination of park and parking garage on the one hand and an office building on the other hand creates an extremely large park area in the central business district of Seattle. Otherwise undesirable effects of noise and fumes from the highway element are somewhat overcome by the rather large area of the park site. All things considered, this joint development project should be a most worthwhile addition to the City of Seattle.

CHERRY STREET RAMP
PARKING GARAGE

General Discussion

This proposal, still in a very preliminary stage, is for a five-story parking garage with a city park on the roof occupying an entire block and extending in part over the Cherry Street freeway ramp. This ramp is now used only by "Bluestreak" express buses under a demonstration program. The block is presently occupied by two aging apartment buildings on private land and a mini-park on land owned by the Department of Highways.

Because the apartment buildings would be replaced by the JD proposal, research team members visited several apartments to explore why residents were living there, for how long they had lived there, and how they liked living there. There appear to be two major groupings of residents, about equal in size. One group are long term residents--white, elderly, and not very mobile. The second are minorities--American Indians, Blacks, and Filipinos--who have generally moved to the area more recently and could not find other housing.

The only residents interviewed were white; when the researcher rang the doorbell or knocked on the door, the occupant would not open the door about half the time, and therefore a more representative sample of the residents could not be obtained.

Most of those interviewed stated that the primary reason for living in these apartments was low rent (\$65-\$80 per month). They usually stated that these apartments were the only places where they could afford to live and that it would be impossible for them to find another apartment at equal monthly costs. Furthermore, several of those interviewed said they

had originally picked these apartments because they had no personal transportation nor money to pay for public transportation. Complaints were made that some residents in the two buildings indulged in excessive drinking and that fights often occurred. The interviewees stated that they were not particularly happy to live in these apartments, but many gave the impression of feeling attached to the apartments since they had always lived there, including the raising of their families. According to the residents, very little social interaction occurs among the apartments' residents mainly due to inability through old age or because of tenant turnover.

Interviewing the apartment manager revealed an average annual turnover rate of one hundred percent. Some apartment tenants however have not changed in forty years while others have changed six times in one year. The manager confirmed that many newcomers appeared to be alcoholics and that fights occurred frequently. It was his opinion that there was no interaction between members of different races and also supported the finding that very little interaction occurred among members of the same race.

It is apparent that before action in regard to the proposed JDP is taken a greater number of the residents in the apartments should be interviewed regarding their present status and what would likely happen to them if they had to relocate. It would be desirable to use white, American Indian, Black, and Filipino interviewers. If adequate substitute housing and/or means for subsidizing the moves of at least the more permanent residents cannot be found, the disbenefits of this joint development should be given considerable weight.

Alternatives and Conclusions

This JD poses many interesting alternatives. In the direction of larger scale, the cosponsor has suggested a possible pedestrian bridge and park over the freeway, similar to the Park Plaza concept. However, this

would require a higher structure than five stories, a considerably longer freeway span, and reliable means for getting people from the top of the structure to street level at all hours. Such problems are technically surmountable, but only at considerable cost and with less obvious aesthetic appeal than Park Plaza.

In the direction of alternative sites, a question can be raised about similar parking garage structures on vacant lots that are being used for street level parking at present, of which several exist in the area. None would by themselves provide the scale of parking contemplated, but neither would they disrupt the apartment houses or create such a concentrated traffic problem at peak hours. (See RE statement following the worksheets.) Due to separate private ownership of such lots, there is no way the Department of Highways can bring such an alternative about, but if sufficient demand for parking exists, one would expect such premium city center sites to be developed for that purpose. Of course, in the absence of a comprehensive city parking plan and city policies to create or encourage creation of parking in desired locations, other uses may well preempt the best parking sites. (The recent downtown parking study does indicate a sizable long-term parking deficit in the area that would be served by the JD proposal, although it is probably too far from the CBD core to be much used for short-term parking relative to downtown retail shopping.)

Another alternative is the creation of a combined apartment and garage structure, that could in theory lodge the type of residents displaced from the old apartment houses. (It is doubtful, however, that the same residents could be accommodated due to the time period between destruction of the existing apartment houses and the construction of a new structure.) Such a result would be impossible without federal housing subsidies, even though possibly technically feasible. And the question should then be raised: is this the best site in the area for such a structure?

A final view that could sensibly be held is that in spite of the hardships that will be created by removing the present apartment structures, it seems unlikely that these old buildings can survive for many more years. Hence, the best possible arrangement should be made for their replacement, at such time as is mutually agreeable with their owner, the City, and the Department of Highways.

There is not enough information about the details of this proposal or the impacts of various acceptable alternatives at the present time to draw a firm conclusion. Rather, it seems best to involve the city staff and public representatives, possibly including the Parking Commission and Design Commission, to get a wider range of opinion on the neighborhood and community merits of different alternatives.

JDP PROPOSAL IDENTIFICATION FORM

Short Title Cherry St. Ramp Parking Garage JDP classification(s) B-6, P-2
 Proposed Location Btw. Cherry, Columbia, 5th and 6th Avenues
 Originated By Mr. G. Mullins (originally Overlake Realty) Project No. 7-675
 (Applicant or highway department's originator)

<u>COSPONSORSHIP</u>	<u>DEFINITE</u>	<u>POSSIBLE</u>	<u>AGENCY OR CONTACT</u>
Federal	()	()	
Other State	()	()	
Local (inc. special district)	()	(✓)	Dept. of Parks & Rec.
Private	(✓)	()	G. Mullins
Other	()	()	

ACTIONS REQUIRED (check as many as are believed to be applicable)

Planning (physical) coordination	(✓)	Airspace lease	(✓)
Community interaction	(✓)	Franchised operator's agreement	()
Design integration	(✓)	Franchise agreement (utility)	()
Construction accommodation	(✓)	Encroachment permit	()
Maintenance or operating agreement	(✓)	Surplus property sale /lease	(✓)
Land acquisition coordination	()	Development of other state properties (within highway corridor)	()

SPATIAL DESIGNATION (relation of joint element to the highway facility)

Airspace (✓) Groundspace (✓) Below-ground () Outside R/W (✓)

LAND TENURE CLASSIFICATION (joint element as related to highway right of way)

I Within normal R/W	(✓)	III On expanded R/W	()
II On Excess property	(✓)	IV On adjacent public property	()
		V On adjacent private property	(✓)

TIMING DISTINCTION

Permanent joint use (✓) Pre-highway construction () Post construction (✓)
 Temporary joint use () Concurrent construction ()

See reverse side for information noted for file purposes.

Worksheet 2

BASIC POLICY ANALYSIS SUMMARY

Project No. 7-675

Question No. and Key Words (Refer to Section 1 for full question and notations)		Yes	No	Not Applicable
(conceptual)				
1	CONCEPT	(S)	()	
2	DEFINITION	(SS)	()	
3	JDP TYPE	(SS)	()	
4	FEDERAL POLICY	(SS)	()	()
5	AUTHORITY	(S)	()	
(operational)				
6	TRAFFIC AND FUNCTION	()	(S)	
7	HEALTH AND SAFETY	(S)	()	
8	LIABILITY	()	(S)	
(community oriented)				
9	GOALS AND OBJECTIVES	()	(S)	
10	LOCAL NEED	(SS)	()	
11	NEIGHBORHOOD COMPATIBILITY	(S)	()	
12	LOCATION	()	(SS)	
13	ALTERNATE JD USES	()	(SS)	
14	LOCAL APPROVAL	()	(SS)	()
15	LOCAL APPROVAL (if #14 is negative)	()	(SS)	()
16	PUBLIC OPINION	()	(S)	
(cosponsorship)				
17	COSPONSOR AUTHORITY	()	(S)	()
18	COSPONSOR FINANCIAL CAPACITY	()	(S)	
19	DEPARTMENT SPONSORSHIP	()	()	(S)
20	FUTURE COSPONSOR	()	()	(S)
(right-of-way)				
21	ORIGINAL PURPOSE	(S)	()	()
22	PUBLIC USE	()	()	(S)
23	PROPERTY RESTRICTION	(S)	()	
24	EXCESS PROPERTY	(S)	()	()
		(S)	()	
Total Affirmative(11)				
Total Negative		(10)		

GENERAL CRITERIA ANALYSIS SUMMARY

JD Project No. <u>7-675</u> Completed by <u>SRI Team</u>		Date <u>November 1971</u>
<u>Subsection and Criterion Title</u>	<u>Rating*</u>	<u>Comments</u>
5.1 PHYSICAL CONSIDERATIONS		
5.1.1 Future Expansion and Obsolescence		
Expansion options	<u>A</u>	
Obsolescence compatibility	<u>A</u>	
5.1.2 Traffic and Accessibility		
Traffic interference and capacity	<u>U</u>	<u>Local street congestion</u>
Access need	<u>Q</u>	<u>Check possible use of Cherry St. ramp</u>
Access spacing and control	<u>NA</u>	
Ramp capacity when access is direct	<u>Q</u>	
Peak-traffic conflicts	<u>Q</u>	<u>Need peak-hour traffic analyses</u>
Local street circulation patterns	<u>NA</u>	
Pedestrian conflicts	<u>Q</u>	
5.1.3 Safety and Health		
Safety impairment	<u>Q</u>	
Air quality control	<u>A</u>	
Noise levels and sound control	<u>A</u>	
Vibration	<u>NA</u>	
Public health aspects	<u>A</u>	
5.1.4 Structural		
Lateral loads (seismic)	<u>Q</u>	
Highway vehicle impact	<u>NA</u>	
Subsurface load increases	<u>Q</u>	
Excavations and structural integrity	<u>Q</u>	
Highway structure attachments	<u>NA</u>	
Falling objects, spillage, side-casting and snow-melt	<u>Q</u>	
5.1.5 Aesthetics		
Physical scale	<u>A</u>	
Visual amenity	<u>Q</u>	
Building appearance and siting	<u>Q</u>	

* Key to Ratings on page 2 of Worksheet

Worksheet 3 (Continued)

Subsection and Criterion Title	Rating*	Comments
5.1.6 Screening and Fencing		
Visual screening	A	
Object retention or deflection (accidental or intentional)	Q	
Restraint fencing	NA	
5.1.7 Illumination		
Driver safety	Q	At ramp areas
Surveillance and crime	Q	
Aesthetics	Q	
5.1.8 Signing		
Demonstration of need	Q	Parking structure, ramp street conflicts
Design and location	Q	
5.1.9 Utilities		
Location and installation (JD projects)	NA	
Appurtenances ancillary to JD	Q	
Attachment to JD structures	NA	
5.1.10 Clearance		
Minimums by cognizant authority	Q	
Special JD considerations	Q	Ramp sight distances
5.1.11 Maintenance		
Impairment to highway element	Q	
Impairment to joint element	Q	
Hazardous conditions	Q	
5.1.12 Construction		
Construction coordination	Q	Over ramp areas
Labor relations	NA	
5.1.13 Fire and Associated Protection(expllosion)		
Protection of joint element	Q	
Protection of highway element	Q	

* Key to Ratings: A = Criterion is adequately met
 Q = Some question exists as to whether the criterion is met
 U = JD performance is unfavorable in relation to criterion
 NA = Criterion not applicable to this project.

Worksheet 3 (Concluded)

<u>Subsection and Criterion Title</u>	<u>Rating*</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<u>5.2 ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS</u>		
5.2.1 Evidence of Demand		
Public uses	<u>A</u>	
Private uses	<u>NA</u>	
5.2.2 Alternative Sites, Uses, or Scales		
Site	<u>U</u>	
Use	<u>Q</u>	
Scale	<u>Q</u>	
5.2.3 Site and Spillover Effects		
Local government costs and tax revenues	<u>A</u>	
Property value changes	<u>A</u>	
Employment	<u>A</u>	
Employment versus unemployment	<u>A</u>	
Personal and business income	<u>A</u>	
Retail sales	<u>Q</u>	Not retail area
Price quantity changes in low income housing markets	<u>U</u>	
Relocation of businesses	<u>NA</u>	
Disruption	<u>Q</u>	For peak hour traffic o
5.2.4 Appraised Value Determination	<u>U</u>	
5.2.5 Cosponsor's Financial Capability	<u>Q</u>	Not known
<u>5.3 LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS</u>		
5.3.1 Land Use and Neighborhood Compatibility	<u>Q</u>	The question here is more of "housing" than parking
5.3.2 Qualification as "Public Use"	<u>NA</u>	
5.3.3 Anti-diversion Amendment Prohibition	<u>Q</u>	Only if highway funds envolved
5.3.4 Tortious Liability	<u>Q</u>	
5.3.5 Sale or Lease Alternatives	<u>Q</u>	
<u>5.4 SOCIAL CONSIDERATIONS</u>		
5.4.1 Community Needs	<u>Q</u>	Check w/City re. housing
5.4.2 Neighborhood Social Conditions	<u>Q</u>	May improve an existing social problem
5.4.3 Community Identity	<u>U</u>	None to date
5.4.4 Family Relocation	<u>Q</u>	Relocation strategy needed.

CHERRY STREET RAMP PARKING GARAGE

As yet, little has been accomplished on this proposal outside of conjecture. According to Gay Mullins, plans for the structure have not as yet been formalized. They have been awaiting word as to the likelihood of such a structure being allowed. The "possible extension over I-5" mentioned in the proposal appears unlikely. The structure would have to reach a greater height than five stories in order to cross the freeway with adequate vertical clearance. A view park on the top level could be a visually beneficial addition. Considerable parking facilities are already available in the immediate area, however, a future need for additional parking may exist. The municipal building offers only limited visitor parking and could possibly utilize additional space.

Ingress and egress to the proposed parking facility has not been discussed in the proposal - congestion can be anticipated. The three adjacent streets, Cherry, Colombia, and Fifth Avenue all carry large traffic loads, plus the freeway tunnel ends on Fifth Avenue which generates additional Blue Streak traffic.

Since the freeway tunnel is used for ingress and egress by the Bluestreak buses, the site would serve better as a "portal" to the city by developing the transit function. The site should optimize the uniqueness of the tunnel and Bluestreak use. Development of a Bluestreak terminal by providing easy pedestrian access and some sort of shelter would be a more advantageous use than parking. Portions of the site might still be developed as a view park.

Eckbo, Dean, Austin & Williams
Jones & Jones

CHERRY STREET RAMP PARKING GARAGE

ACCESSIBILITY

A joint element parking garage is assumed to have five levels. Based on the size of the garage, a qualitative highway access is shown. The geometric conditions that are extant on this Interstate-5 preclude the inclusion of more ramps. More specifically, the joint development project location a considerable grade exists between the freeway lanes and the joint element. Therefore, ingress from the freeway, within reasonable economic bounds, is at this location.

The garage is well positioned to utilize existing ramps to and from the freeway with a minimum of travel on city streets. Vehicles using the garage traveling to and from either north or south need not go any further than Sixth Avenue. All the north-south travel of vehicles between the freeway and the parking garage will be on Sixth and Seventh Avenues, and away from frontage roads.

The discussion assumes that ingress and egress for the parking garage will be on Sixth Avenue. This, however, creates a problem at five o'clock in the afternoon at the intersection of Sixth and Cherry Streets. Vehicles traveling on Sixth Avenue encounter a stop sign and must yield the right-of-way to vehicles on Cherry Street. Cherry Street is presently overloaded during the afternoon. Alternate methods of egress from the parking garage should be considered. Egress onto Cherry Street eastbound for those vehicles desiring to go to the freeway southbound would require weaving across both lanes of the freeway in less than one block. Egress to Columbia Street westbound, on the other hand, would be a rather simple matter. Southbound freeway traffic would travel one block south on Fifth Avenue, then a block east on Cherry Street, and then north on Sixth Avenue to the freeway.

impact
in the afternoon.
effect of the
consideration
of

doubtedly
for
d.

the parking
is more feasible

with the
two reasons.
the collapse
portion
of Blue Streak
during the

off ramp
loads on
allowed
management.

should be
park structure

a

spectacular view, especially to the north and south, normal to the long axis of the park. Therefore, solid landscaping, which would deter people from dropping objects onto the roadway and provide a shield against noise and air pollution from the roadway would also block the park users view. The park designers should provide adequate shielding while preserving the view. One method of allowing people a view to the north and south while keeping them from dropping things onto the highway below would be a ledge at the level of the soffit of the park bridge to catch falling objects. Care must be taken to prevent pedestrian access to such a ledge; however, such a system would not stop people from purposely throwing objects past the screen down onto the highway below.

ILLUMINATION

Illumination plans for the joint element are unknown at this time. The levels of illumination necessary for a parking structure and a passive park should not create any problem for the highway user. However, some care must be taken with luminaire location near the edge of the park structure to prevent excessive light-spill onto the roadways below.

The highway user approaching the Cherry Street area, particularly from the south traveling on the elevated roadway, is used to a broad, unobstructed view ahead and to the sides. The appearance of this park bridge structure, with its supporting columns quite close to the traveled way, might be disconcerting. Illumination of the supporting elements of the park bridge should afford security to the driver. The structure would certainly draw the motorist's attention, being a one block wide bridge structure above an already elevated roadway.

SIGNING

Signs on the highway directing motorists to this joint development project are not warranted. This particular joint development is not a major generator of traffic, and as such, a need for signing is questionable. Secondly, the entire

section of the freeway through the downtown area can be classified as an interchange, and in the particular area of this site, many physical features abound which create distractions for a motorist. The location of guide signs on the freeway to this particular joint development would create undue proliferation of signs in the area and as such is not desirable. It is not anticipated that signing on the city streets would be required. Normal garage entrance identification should be adequate.

CLEARANCE

The location of the view park structure on top of the parking garage and extending over the highway has not yet been determined. At such time as it is, however, particular attention should be given to vertical clearance over the extreme east lanes of the elevated highway. The soffit of the park bridge structure will probably need to be as close to the elevated traveled way as possible at that point because the park bridge structure will need to get back down to ground level within a reasonable horizontal distance.

Particular attention should be paid to columns supporting the park bridge structure placed between sections of elevated roadway. The sections of elevated roadway are quite close together at this point. There is room between them, however, to accommodate columns supporting the park bridge above. When their size and configuration have been determined, visual effect upon the highway user should be evaluated.

Another alternative is to span the park bridge structure from the parking garage west of Sixth Avenue to a line of supports east of Seventh Avenue. This would require a rather large bridge structure, more expensive than one with intermediate supports, but would probably be less disconcerting to the motorist below.

MAINTENANCE

The type of construction likely for this proposed joint element should not require maintenance to be performed from the roadways. The Highway Department will have some increase in maintenance of illumination. It is assumed that the City will maintain the park element and that the private owner will maintain the parking structure and its grounds. The State could be relieved of maintenance of some of the existing landscaping adjacent to the ramp terminals.

CONSTRUCTION

The construction of the joint element will require extensive coordination with the Department of Highways to minimize traffic conflicts during the construction period. Safety provisions will create additional cost to the joint element, and interference with normal traffic operation will create user costs to the motorist. These factors must be taken into account in finalizing the joint development agreements.

FIRE AND ASSOCIATED PROTECTION (EXPLOSION)

Both the parking garage joint element and the park joint element could affect or be affected by the highway element as a result of fire or explosion on either element. The parking garage structure is somewhat further away from the highway than the park structure. Were the parking garage to have a solid east wall it would provide an excellent shield between the highway and the joint element. A solid wall is quite likely anyway because it represents the line of support for the park overpass structure above. The parking garage design will probably dictate that the line of supports be as narrow as possible in the east-west direction so as to encroach as little as possible into the useable parking space.

The park bridge structure forms an effective shield between the two elements. This shield would protect park users from all but the most catastrophic events on the highway. Assuming the park structure is a block wide, its users would be able to evacuate the park were there a fire on the highway below.

SUMMARY

This joint development project presents a unique example of three-tiered use of air space. On grade is Cherry Street and the existing parking lot. The next level up consists of an elevated portion of Interstate-5. The next level above that consists of the City park structure spanning over the highway. All else being equal, the triple use of the same space within an urban area maximizes urban space. The joint development project, however, could have been far more economical and functional if the various elements had been designed at the same time.

There will be several difficulties that will be encountered in building the park bridge structure. If there are intermediate supports between the portions of elevated highway, the foundations will have to be placed and the columns begun in the City parking lot. The columns above the elevated roadway, as well as the park bridge structure itself, will be built above the interstate highway while it is in use.

From the elevated roadway down, there will be two separate sets of supports, one for the highway structure and one for the park bridge structure. These two sets of supports could have been combined had the two elements been designed at the same time. The columns supporting the park bridge structure will have to be considerably larger, extending from the ground to the bridge structure, than they would have been had they been laterally supported at the elevated highway.

HARBORVIEW PARKING GARAGE AND VIEW PARK

General Discussion

This joint development involves a two-story garage topped by a park and heliopad to the West of Harborview Hospital, largely on excess freeway right-of-way, primarily to serve expanded hospital parking needs. The land is currently unpaved, except for a heliopad, and is partly used already for hospital-related parking. The area is multistory residential in nature, traffic in the area is moderate, street parking is usually in short supply, and there are no parks and few public parking lots in the area.

Interviews with residents in the area revealed a neutral to somewhat positive stance regarding the joint development. Most stated that the park, with its exceptional view of the downtown and harbor area, would be a positive addition to all residents of the area. It is seen as particularly positive by residents of a high rise apartment house for the elderly which is just north of the site. Currently this group has no place to sit outside except in the entranceway to their residence. Because of age and infirmities and lack of mobility they are not able to use facilities in other areas, hence the park would serve them well.

Alternatives and Conclusions

The site in question is ideally suited either for a park or a hospital garage and a heliopad, and the design challenge will be to incorporate these uses without undue conflict--both in a physical and aesthetic sense. The concept of a limited-capacity garage topped by a park appears reasonable, and also takes into account the need to avoid creating instability of the land slope fronting the site above the freeway. It is not clear

BASIC POLICY ANALYSIS SUMMARY

Project No. 7-675

Question No. and Key Words (Refer to Section 1 for full question and notations)		Yes	No	Not Applicable
(conceptual)				
1	CONCEPT	(S)	()	
2	DEFINITION	(S)	()	
3	JDP TYPE	(S)	()	
4	FEDERAL POLICY	(S)	()	()
5	AUTHORITY	(S)	()	
(operational)				
6	TRAFFIC AND FUNCTION	()	(S)	
7	HEALTH AND SAFETY	(S)	()	
8	LIABILITY	()	(S)	
(community oriented)				
9	GOALS AND OBJECTIVES	()	(S)	
10	LOCAL NEED	(S)	()	
11	NEIGHBORHOOD COMPATIBILITY	(S)	()	
12	LOCATION	()	(S)	
13	ALTERNATE JD USES	()	(S)	
14	LOCAL APPROVAL	()	(S)	()
15	LOCAL APPROVAL (if #14 is negative)	()	(S)	()
16	PUBLIC OPINION	()	(S)	
(cosponsorship)				
17	COSPONSOR AUTHORITY	()	(S)	()
18	COSPONSOR FINANCIAL CAPACITY	()	(S)	
19	DEPARTMENT SPONSORSHIP	()	()	(S)
20	FUTURE COSPONSOR	()	()	(S)
(right-of-way)				
21	ORIGINAL PURPOSE	(S)	()	()
22	PUBLIC USE	()	()	(S)
23	PROPERTY RESTRICTION	(S)	()	
24	EXCESS PROPERTY	(S)	()	()
		(S)	()	
Total Affirmative (11)				
Total Negative			(10)	

GENERAL CRITERIA ANALYSIS SUMMARY

JD Project No. <u>7-675</u> Completed by <u>SRI Team</u>		Date <u>November 1971</u>
<u>Subsection and Criterion Title</u>	<u>Rating*</u>	<u>Comments</u>
5.1 PHYSICAL CONSIDERATIONS		
5.1.1 Future Expansion and Obsolescence		
Expansion options	<u>A</u>	
Obsolescence compatibility	<u>A</u>	
5.1.2 Traffic and Accessibility		
Traffic interference and capacity	<u>U</u>	<u>Local street congestion</u>
Access need	<u>Q</u>	<u>Check possible use of</u> <u>Cherry St. ramp</u>
Access spacing and control	<u>NA</u>	
Ramp capacity when access is direct	<u>Q</u>	
Peak-traffic conflicts	<u>Q</u>	<u>Need peak-hour traffic</u> <u>analyses</u>
Local street circulation patterns	<u>NA</u>	
Pedestrian conflicts	<u>Q</u>	
5.1.3 Safety and Health		
Safety impairment	<u>Q</u>	
Air quality control	<u>A</u>	
Noise levels and sound control	<u>A</u>	
Vibration	<u>NA</u>	
Public health aspects	<u>A</u>	
5.1.4 Structural		
Lateral loads (seismic)	<u>Q</u>	
Highway vehicle impact	<u>NA</u>	
Subsurface load increases	<u>Q</u>	
Excavations and structural integrity	<u>Q</u>	
Highway structure attachments	<u>NA</u>	
Falling objects, spillage, side-casting and snow-melt	<u>Q</u>	
5.1.5 Aesthetics		
Physical scale	<u>A</u>	
Visual amenity	<u>Q</u>	
Building appearance and siting	<u>Q</u>	

* Key to Ratings on page 2 of Worksheet

Worksheet 3 (Continued)

Subsection and Criterion Title	Rating*	Comments
5.1.6 Screening and Fencing		
Visual screening	A	
Object retention or deflection (accidental or intentional)	Q	
Restraint fencing	NA	
5.1.7 Illumination		
Driver safety	Q	At ramp areas
Surveillance and crime	Q	
Aesthetics	Q	
5.1.8 Signing		
Demonstration of need	Q	Parking structure, ramp street conflicts
Design and location	Q	
5.1.9 Utilities		
Location and installation (JD projects)	NA	
Appurtenances ancillary to JD	Q	
Attachment to JD structures	NA	
5.1.10 Clearance		
Minimums by cognizant authority	Q	
Special JD considerations	Q	Ramp sight distances
5.1.11 Maintenance		
Impairment to highway element	Q	
Impairment to joint element	Q	
Hazardous conditions	Q	
5.1.12 Construction		
Construction coordination	Q	Over ramp areas
Labor relations	NA	
5.1.13 Fire and Associated Protection(explosion)		
Protection of joint element	Q	
Protection of highway element	Q	

* Key to Ratings: A = Criterion is adequately met
 Q = Some question exists as to whether the criterion is met
 U = JD performance is unfavorable in relation to criterion
 NA = Criterion not applicable to this project.

Worksheet 3 (Concluded)

<u>Subsection and Criterion Title</u>	<u>Rating*</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<u>5.2 ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS</u>		
5.2.1 Evidence of Demand		
Public uses	<u>A</u>	
Private uses	<u>NA</u>	
5.2.2 Alternative Sites, Uses, or Scales		
Site	<u>U</u>	
Use	<u>Q</u>	
Scale	<u>Q</u>	
5.2.3 Site and Spillover Effects		
Local government costs and tax revenues	<u>A</u>	
Property value changes	<u>A</u>	
Employment	<u>A</u>	
Employment versus unemployment	<u>A</u>	
Personal and business income	<u>A</u>	
Retail sales	<u>Q</u>	Not retail area
Price quantity changes in low income housing markets	<u>U</u>	
Relocation of businesses	<u>NA</u>	
Disruption	<u>Q</u>	For peak hour traffic o
5.2.4 Appraised Value Determination	<u>U</u>	
5.2.5 Cosponsor's Financial Capability	<u>Q</u>	Not known
<u>5.3 LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS</u>		
5.3.1 Land Use and Neighborhood Compatibility	<u>Q</u>	The question here is mor of "housing" than parkin
5.3.2 Qualification as "Public Use"	<u>NA</u>	
5.3.3 Anti-diversion Amendment Prohibition	<u>Q</u>	Only if highway funds envolved
5.3.4 Tortious Liability	<u>Q</u>	
5.3.5 Sale or Lease Alternatives	<u>Q</u>	
<u>5.4 SOCIAL CONSIDERATIONS</u>		
5.4.1 Community Needs	<u>Q</u>	Check w/City re. housing
5.4.2 Neighborhood Social Conditions	<u>Q</u>	May improve an existing social problem
5.4.3 Community Identity	<u>U</u>	None to date
5.4.4 Family Relocation	<u>Q</u>	Relocation strategy needed.

CHERRY STREET RAMP PARKING GARAGE

As yet, little has been accomplished on this proposal outside of conjecture. According to Gay Mullins, plans for the structure have not as yet been formalized. They have been awaiting word as to the likelihood of such a structure being allowed. The "possible extension over I-5" mentioned in the proposal appears unlikely. The structure would have to reach a greater height than five stories in order to cross the freeway with adequate vertical clearance. A view park on the top level could be a visually beneficial addition. Considerable parking facilities are already available in the immediate area, however, a future need for additional parking may exist. The municipal building offers only limited visitor parking and could possibly utilize additional space.

Ingress and egress to the proposed parking facility has not been discussed in the proposal - congestion can be anticipated. The three adjacent streets, Cherry, Colombia, and Fifth Avenue all carry large traffic loads, plus the freeway tunnel ends on Fifth Avenue which generates additional Blue Streak traffic.

Since the freeway tunnel is used for ingress and egress by the Bluestreak buses, the site would serve better as a "portal" to the city by developing the transit function. The site should optimize the uniqueness of the tunnel and Bluestreak use. Development of a Bluestreak terminal by providing easy pedestrian access and some sort of shelter would be a more advantageous use than parking. Portions of the site might still be developed as a view park.

Eckbo, Dean, Austin & Williams
Jones & Jones

CHERRY STREET RAMP PARKING GARAGE

impact
afternoon.
fact of the
consideration
nts of

ACCESSIBILITY

Joint element parking garage is assumed to have five levels

doubtedly
for
d.

Based on the size of the garage, a qualitative highway access is shown. The geometric conditions that are extant on this Interstate-5 preclude the inclusion of more ramps. More specifically, the joint development project location a considerable grade exists between the freeway lanes and the joint element. Therefore, ingress from the freeway, within reasonable economic bounds, is at this location.

the parking
more feasible

The garage is well positioned to utilize existing ramps to and from the freeway with a minimum of travel on city streets. Vehicles using the garage traveling to and from either north or south need not go any farther than Sixth Avenue. All the north-south travel of vehicles between the freeway and the parking garage will be on Sixth and Seventh Avenues, and freeway frontage roads.

with the
two reasons.
collapse
portion
Blue Streak
ing the

The discussion assumes that ingress and egress for the parking garage will be on Sixth Avenue. This, however, creates a problem at five o'clock in the afternoon at the intersection of Sixth and Cherry Streets. Vehicles traveling east on Sixth Avenue encounter a stop sign and must yield the right-of-way to vehicles on Cherry Street. Cherry Street is presently overloaded during the afternoon.

off ramp
loads on
allowed
ement.

Alternate methods of egress from the parking garage should be considered. Egress onto Cherry Street eastbound for those vehicles desiring to exit the freeway southbound would require weaving across both lanes of the freeway in less than one block. Egress to Columbia Street westbound, on the other hand, would be a rather simple matter. Southbound freeway traffic would exit one block south on Fifth Avenue, then a block east on Cherry Street, and then north on Sixth Avenue to the freeway.

s should be
rk structure
a

spectacular view, especially to the north and south, normal to the long axis of the park. Therefore, solid landscaping, which would deter people from dropping objects onto the roadway and provide a shield against noise and air pollution from the roadway would also block the park users view. The park designers should provide adequate shielding while preserving the view. One method of allowing people a view to the north and south while keeping them from dropping things onto the highway below would be a ledge at the level of the soffit of the park bridge to catch falling objects. Care must be taken to prevent pedestrian access to such a ledge; however, such a system would not stop people from purposely throwing objects past the screen down onto the highway below.

ILLUMINATION

Illumination plans for the joint element are unknown at this time. The levels of illumination necessary for a parking structure and a passive park should not create any problem for the highway user. However, some care must be taken with luminaire location near the edge of the park structure to prevent excessive light-spill onto the roadways below.

The highway user approaching the Cherry Street area, particularly from the south traveling on the elevated roadway, is used to a broad, unobstructed view ahead and to the sides. The appearance of this park bridge structure, with its supporting columns quite close to the traveled way, might be disconcerting. Illumination of the supporting elements of the park bridge should afford security to the driver. The structure would certainly draw the motorist's attention, being a one block wide bridge structure above an already elevated roadway.

SIGNING

Signs on the highway directing motorists to this joint development project are not warranted. This particular joint development is not a major generator of traffic, and as such, a need for signing is questionable. Secondly, the entire

section of the freeway through the downtown area can be classified as an interchange, and in the particular area of this site, many physical features abound which create distractions for a motorist. The location of guide signs on the freeway to this particular joint development would create undue proliferation of signs in the area and as such is not desirable. It is not anticipated that signing on the city streets would be required. Normal garage entrance identification should be adequate.

CLEARANCE

The location of the view park structure on top of the parking garage and extending over the highway has not yet been determined. At such time as it is, however, particular attention should be given to vertical clearance over the extreme east lanes of the elevated highway. The soffit of the park bridge structure will probably need to be as close to the elevated traveled way as possible at that point because the park bridge structure will need to get back down to ground level within a reasonable horizontal distance.

Particular attention should be paid to columns supporting the park bridge structure placed between sections of elevated roadway. The sections of elevated roadway are quite close together at this point. There is room between them, however, to accommodate columns supporting the park bridge above. When their size and configuration have been determined, visual effect upon the highway user should be evaluated.

Another alternative is to span the park bridge structure from the parking garage west of Sixth Avenue to a line of supports east of Seventh Avenue. This would require a rather large bridge structure, more expensive than one with intermediate supports, but would probably be less disconcerting to the motorist below.

MAINTENANCE

The type of construction likely for this proposed joint element should not require maintenance to be performed from the roadways. The Highway Department will have some increase in maintenance of illumination. It is assumed that the City will maintain the park element and that the private owner will maintain the parking structure and its grounds. The State could be relieved of maintenance of some of the existing landscaping adjacent to the ramp terminals.

CONSTRUCTION

The construction of the joint element will require extensive coordination with the Department of Highways to minimize traffic conflicts during the construction period. Safety provisions will create additional cost to the joint element, and interference with normal traffic operation will create user costs to the motorist. These factors must be taken into account in finalizing the joint development agreements.

FIRE AND ASSOCIATED PROTECTION (EXPLOSION)

Both the parking garage joint element and the park joint element could affect or be affected by the highway element as a result of fire or explosion on either element. The parking garage structure is somewhat further away from the highway than the park structure. Were the parking garage to have a solid east wall it would provide an excellent shield between the highway and the joint element. A solid wall is quite likely anyway because it represents the line of support for the park overpass structure above. The parking garage design will probably dictate that the line of supports be as narrow as possible in the east-west direction so as to encroach as little as possible into the useable parking space.

The park bridge structure forms an effective shield between the two elements. This shield would protect park users from all but the most catastrophic events on the highway. Assuming the park structure is a block wide, its users would be able to evacuate the park were there a fire on the highway below.

SUMMARY

This joint development project presents a unique example of three-tiered use of air space. On grade is Cherry Street and the existing parking lot. The next level up consists of an elevated portion of Interstate-5. The next level above that consists of the City park structure spanning over the highway. All else being equal, the triple use of the same space within an urban area maximizes urban space. The joint development project, however, could have been far more economical and functional if the various elements had been designed at the same time.

There will be several difficulties that will be encountered in building the park bridge structure. If there are intermediate supports between the portions of elevated highway, the foundations will have to be placed and the columns begun in the City parking lot. The columns above the elevated roadway, as well as the park bridge structure itself, will be built above the interstate highway while it is in use.

From the elevated roadway down, there will be two separate sets of supports, one for the highway structure and one for the park bridge structure. These two sets of supports could have been combined had the two elements been designed at the same time. The columns supporting the park bridge structure will have to be considerably larger, extending from the ground to the bridge structure, than they would have been had they been laterally supported at the elevated highway.

HARBORVIEW PARKING GARAGE AND VIEW PARK

General Discussion

This joint development involves a two-story garage topped by a park and heliopad to the West of Harborview Hospital, largely on excess freeway right-of-way, primarily to serve expanded hospital parking needs. The land is currently unpaved, except for a heliopad, and is partly used already for hospital-related parking. The area is multistory residential in nature, traffic in the area is moderate, street parking is usually in short supply, and there are no parks and few public parking lots in the area.

Interviews with residents in the area revealed a neutral to somewhat positive stance regarding the joint development. Most stated that the park, with its exceptional view of the downtown and harbor area, would be a positive addition to all residents of the area. It is seen as particularly positive by residents of a high rise apartment house for the elderly which is just north of the site. Currently this group has no place to sit outside except in the entranceway to their residence. Because of age and infirmities and lack of mobility they are not able to use facilities in other areas, hence the park would serve them well.

Alternatives and Conclusions

The site in question is ideally suited either for a park or a hospital garage and a heliopad, and the design challenge will be to incorporate these uses without undue conflict--both in a physical and aesthetic sense. The concept of a limited-capacity garage topped by a park appears reasonable, and also takes into account the need to avoid creating instability of the land slope fronting the site above the freeway. It is not clear

Worksheet 1

JDP PROPOSAL IDENTIFICATION FORM

Short Title HARBORVIEW PARKING GARAGE and VIEW PARK JDP classification(s) B-6, P-2, T-1
 Proposed Location West of and adjacent to 8th Ave. at Harborview Hospital
 Originated By King County Project No. 7-328
 (Applicant or highway department's originator)

<u>COSPONSORSHIP</u>	<u>DEFINITE</u>	<u>POSSIBLE</u>	<u>AGENCY OR CONTACT</u>
Federal	()	()	
Other State	()	()	
Local (inc. special district)	(✓)	()	<u>Harborview Medical Center and Seattle Dept. of Parks & Rec.</u>
Private	()	()	
Other	()	()	

ACTIONS REQUIRED (check as many as are believed to be applicable)

Planning (physical) coordination	(✓)	Airspace lease	(✓)
Community interaction	(✓)	Franchised operator's agreement	()
Design integration	()	Franchise agreement (utility)	()
Construction accommodation	()	Encroachment permit	()
Maintenance or operating agreement	(✓)	Surplus property sale	()
Land acquisition coordination	()	Development of other state properties (within highway corridor)	()

SPATIAL DESIGNATION (relation of joint element to the highway facility)

Airspace () Groundspace (✓) Below-ground () Outside R/W (✓)

LAND TENURE CLASSIFICATION (joint element as related to highway right of way)

I Within normal R/W () III On expanded R/W ()
 II On Excess property (✓) IV On adjacent public property (✓)
 V On adjacent private property ()

TIMING DISTINCTION

Permanent joint use (✓) Pre-highway construction () Post construction (✓)
 Temporary joint use () Concurrent construction ()

See reverse side for information noted for file purposes.

OTHER INFORMATION:

Estimated cost to highway department

\$ 118,000 ⁽¹⁾

- Sources: (1) Federal \$ _____
- (2) State highway fund \$ _____
- (3) _____ \$ _____

Estimated cost to cosponsor(2)

\$ 1.3^m

- Sources: (1) _____ \$ _____
- (2) _____ \$ _____
- (3) _____ \$ _____

Size of joint development project

2.75 (acres)

Amount of highway land or airspace involved in JDP

2.2 (acres)

If airspace, state any vertical limits to be specified
[If unlimited as to height, check here ()]

(3) (ft)

Appraised value of State's portion of land or airspace
proposed to be utilized by the proposed project.

\$ 960,000 ⁽³⁾

OTHER COMMENTS:

- (1) Allocated for highway landscaping
- (2) Limited to 2-story height; roof surface approx. equal to 8th Ave's elevation
- (3) Based on highest and best use (high-rise multi-family). However, the value would be considerably less with contemplated site restrictions (see note 2 above); and no economic value can be determined for park use.

BASIC POLICY ANALYSIS SUMMARY

Project No. 7-328

Question No. and Key Words (Refer to Section 4 for full question and notations)		Yes	No	Not Applicable
(conceptual)				
1	CONCEPT	(S)	()	
2	DEFINITION	(S)	()	
3	JDP TYPE	(S)	()	
4	FEDERAL POLICY	(S)	()	()
5	AUTHORITY	(S)	()	
(operational)				
6	TRAFFIC AND FUNCTION	()	(S)	
7	HEALTH AND SAFETY	(S)	()	
8	LIABILITY	(S)	()	
(community oriented)				
9	GOALS AND OBJECTIVES	(S)	()	
10	LOCAL NEED	(S)	()	
11	NEIGHBORHOOD COMPATIBILITY	(S)	()	
12	LOCATION	(S)	()	
13	ALTERNATE JD USES	()	(S)	
14	LOCAL APPROVAL	()	(S)	()
15	LOCAL APPROVAL (if #14 is negative)	(S)	()	()
16	PUBLIC OPINION	(S)	()	
(cosponsorship)				
17	COSPONSOR AUTHORITY	(S)	()	()
18	COSPONSOR FINANCIAL CAPACITY	(S)	(S) in part	
19	DEPARTMENT SPONSORSHIP	()	()	(S)
20	FUTURE COSPONSOR	()	()	(S)
(right-of-way)				
21	ORIGINAL PURPOSE	()	(S)	()
22	PUBLIC USE	()	()	(S)
23	PROPERTY RESTRICTION	(S)	()	
24	EXCESS PROPERTY	(S)	()	()
Total Affirmative (17)				
Total Negative			(5)	

GENERAL CRITERIA ANALYSIS SUMMARY

JD Project No. <u>7-328</u> Completed by <u>SRI Team</u>		Date <u>November 1971</u>
<u>Subsection and Criterion Title</u>	<u>Rating*</u>	<u>Comments</u>
5.1 <u>PHYSICAL CONSIDERATIONS</u>		
5.1.1 Future Expansion and Obsolescence		
Expansion options	<u>A</u>	
Obsolescence compatibility	<u>A</u>	
5.1.2 Traffic and Accessibility		
Traffic interference and capacity	<u>A</u>	
Access need	<u>NA</u>	
Access spacing and control	<u>NA</u>	
Ramp capacity when access is direct	<u>NA</u>	
Peak-traffic conflicts	<u>A</u>	
Local street circulation patterns	<u>A</u>	
Pedestrian conflicts	<u>A</u>	
5.1.3 Safety and Health		
Safety impairment	<u>A</u>	
Air quality control	<u>A</u>	
Noise levels and sound control	<u>A</u>	
Vibration	<u>A</u>	
Public health aspects	<u>A</u>	
5.1.4 Structural		
Lateral loads (seismic)	<u>A</u>	
Highway vehicle impact	<u>NA</u>	
Subsurface load increases	<u>Q</u>	Check final plans
Excavations and structural integrity	<u>NA</u>	
Highway structure attachments	<u>NA</u>	
Falling objects, spillage, side-casting and snow-melt	<u>A</u>	
5.1.5 Aesthetics		
Physical scale	<u>A</u>	
Visual amenity	<u>A</u>	
Building appearance and siting	<u>Q</u>	Check exterior design

* Key to Ratings on page 2 of Worksheet

Worksheet 3 (Continued)

<u>Subsection and Criterion Title</u>	<u>Rating*</u>	<u>Comments</u>
5.1.6 Screening and Fencing		
Visual screening	<u>A</u>	
Object retention or deflection (accidental or intentional)	<u>Q</u>	Final location of R/W fence
Restraint fencing	<u>A</u>	Already exists
5.1.7 Illumination		
Driver safety	<u>A</u>	
Surveillance and crime	<u>Q</u>	Check design
Aesthetics	<u>Q</u>	" "
5.1.8 Signing		
Demonstration of need	<u>A</u>	Based on hospital signi
Design and location	<u>NA</u>	
5.1.9 Utilities		
Location and installation (JD projects)	<u>NA</u>	
Appurtenances ancillary to JD	<u>NA</u>	
Attachment to JD structures	<u>NA</u>	
5.1.10 Clearance		
Minimums by cognizant authority	<u>NA</u>	
Special JD considerations	<u>A</u>	
5.1.11 Maintenance		
Impairment to highway element	<u>A</u>	
Impairment to joint element	<u>A</u>	
Hazardous conditions	<u>A</u>	
5.1.12 Construction		
Construction coordination	<u>Q</u>	Effect on existing retaining walls?
Labor relations	<u>NA</u>	
5.1.13 Fire and Associated Protection(explosion)		
Protection of joint element	<u>A</u>	
Protection of highway element	<u>A</u>	

<p>* Key to Ratings: A = Criterion is adequately met Q = Some question exists as to whether the criterion is met U = JD performance is unfavorable in relation to criterion NA = Criterion not applicable to this project.</p>

Worksheet 3 (Concluded)

<u>Subsection and Criterion Title</u>	<u>Rating*</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<u>5.2 ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS</u>		
5.2.1 Evidence of Demand		
Public uses	<u>A</u>	
Private uses	<u>A</u>	
5.2.2 Alternative Sites, Uses, or Scales		
Site	<u>A</u>	
Use	<u>A</u>	
Scale	<u>A</u>	
5.2.3 Site and Spillover Effects	<u>A</u>	No significant effect, except possibly increase in nearby land values
Local government costs and tax revenues		
Property value changes		
Employment		
Employment versus unemployment		
Personal and business income		
Retail sales		
Price quantity changes in low income housing markets		
Relocation of businesses		
Disruption		
5.2.4 Appraised Value Determination	<u>A</u>	
5.2.5 Cosponsor's Financial Capability	<u>Q</u>	For full development at this time
<u>5.3 LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS</u>		
5.3.1 Land Use and Neighborhood Compatibility	<u>Q</u>	Zoning question
5.3.2 Qualification as "Public Use"	<u>NA</u>	
5.3.3 Anti-diversion Amendment Prohibition	<u>A</u>	
5.3.4 Tortious Liability	<u>Q</u>	Top deck railing protection
5.3.5 Sale or Lease Alternatives	<u>Q</u>	Check original R/W acquisition conditions
<u>5.4 SOCIAL CONSIDERATIONS</u>		
5.4.1 Community Needs	<u>A</u>	
5.4.2 Neighborhood Social Conditions	<u>A</u>	
5.4.3 Community Identity	<u>Q</u>	May lack neighborhood group involvement
5.4.4 Family Relocation	<u>NA</u>	

HARBORVIEW PARKING GARAGE AND VIEW PARK

Use of the area between Harborview Hospital and the freeway for parking would have little impact on the freeway itself. The parking would not be likely to generate significant additional traffic, since it would be used by hospital employees and patrons only.

The view park and landscaping of the hill would improve the view from the freeway, and from the city. The freeway has left a very noticeable scar on Seattle at this point that needs rectification. It is the view framed when coming up Yesler or Terrace streets, and at present, one is met by a particularly disappointing reminder of the freeway. With proper treatment of the hillside, the freeway impact upon the viewer could be minimized while maximizing the amenities of the open space. The view park would also be advantageous from the standpoint of the hospital - it would enhance the view from the windows, as well as being usable by ambulatory patients, hospital staff, and visitors.

Incorporation of a heliopad is a logical addition for use in emergency cases, such as automobile accident victims etc. Joyce, Copeland and Vaughan are presently working on plans for a three level garage, top level view park and heliopad for Harborview Hospital. It appears that Harborview has made a commitment to this project in its hiring of the architects to work out a plan for the proposed facilities.

Apartments could be incorporated into the site as an alternate use. With well planned placement of the structures and careful treatment of the hillside, the same visual impact of an open space could be provided for the freeway user, and viewers from the city.

Eckbo, Dean, Austin & Williams
Jones & Jones

HARBORVIEW PARKING GARAGE AND VIEW PARK

TRAFFIC AND ACCESSIBILITY

This proposal does not contemplate direct access from I-5. The physical separation of the joint element from the highway precludes any indirect effect upon the capacity or operation of I-5. No substantive deviation from the existing access control is required.

The project involves the establishment of one-way traffic circulation around the hospital and serving the proposed garage, together with attendant improvement of Eighth Avenue. These improvements will substantially improve the access to the hospital complex and are an important community benefit resulting from this proposed joint development. The clientele for this garage will presumably be hospital oriented - staff, visitors, etc., so the peaking characteristic of this traffic should not seriously conflict with that on servicing arterials.

It is presumed that the view park occupying the top of this facility will attract considerable pedestrian traffic. Most will be from the nearby apartments and public housing, as well as from the hospital itself. The "dead end" character of the streets in the immediate vicinity should preclude any particular problem with pedestrian-automobile conflicts, and no unusual measures would seem to be warranted.

STRUCTURAL FEATURES

The relatively large distance between this facility and the existing highway precludes any particular problem with structural conflicts between the two elements. The major structural problem at this site is related to the foundation condition prevalent in this area. Great care must be exercised during design and construction to ensure that the concrete cylinder pile retaining wall located adjacent to the highway is not overloaded. The interrelationship between the hospital, the existing slopes, and the retaining wall must be judiciously maintained or disaster could result.

The lateral clearance between the joint element and the traveled way makes it unlikely that objects could fall or be spilled from the garage area to the roadway of I-5. There could be a trash problem, however, and provisions should be incorporated in the design of the joint element (particularly the park) to discourage the dropping or throwing of refuse over its railing feature.

SCREENING AND FENCING

Screening of this facility can be restricted to that required for safety and that which would discourage the accidental dropping of objects beyond the limits of the park. Screening to restrain active recreation or screening to obscure the joint element from view from the highway is not appropriate. The screening method utilized should not interfere with one of the prime features of the park, namely, the magnificent view of downtown Seattle and Puget Sound.

ILLUMINATION

The joint development project is sufficiently set back and sufficiently above the highway to ensure that illumination of the joint element will not be distracting to the highway user.

The parking garage portion of the joint element should be adequately illuminated at night because it serves the hospital 24 hours a day.

The park portion on top of the parking garage should also be adequately illuminated at night for security reasons. Care must be taken that nearby housing units are not disturbed by light-spill from the illumination of the joint element. This view park, with one of the finest city views available, will undoubtedly be well used at night to view the lights of the city.

SIGNING

The joint development project should not have directional signs on the freeway. Harborview Hospital, however, which is served by the parking garage, is signed from the freeway. Therefore, signing of the joint development from the freeway has in a sense been taken care of because of the presence of the hospital which the joint element serves.

As far as signing on local streets is concerned, consideration is and should be given to the hospital. Directional signing to the garage should be provided in the immediate vicinity of the hospital. The view park might be signed, however, no signing should be installed that would interfere with hospital access signing.

CLEARANCE

The rather unusual lateral clearance inherent to this joint development provides more than adequate spaciousness for both elements.

MAINTENANCE

The garage will be maintained by the hospital and the park will be maintained by the City. This is another example of a benefit to the Department of Highways because of joint development. Here we have a considerable area of land which, because of joint development, will be maintained by other agencies; thus relieving the Department of Highways of that responsibility.

No access from the highway proper will be necessary to maintain the joint element, and no special maintenance problems will accrue to the Department of Highways.

CONSTRUCTION

Coordination between the designers of the joint element and the Department of Highways is essential to ensure that new construction does not overload the cylinder pile retaining wall located between the joint element and the highway.

During construction and operation of the joint element, coordination will be essential between the various sponsors of the joint element. These sponsors are King County, responsible for construction of the garage and view park; the City, responsible for maintenance of the park; and Harborview Hospital, an extension of the University of Washington Hospital, responsible for operation of the parking garage.

FIRE AND ASSOCIATED PROTECTION (EXPLOSION)

The joint element is separated from the traveled way by both horizontal distance and elevation above the roadway. Therefore, a catastrophic event involving fire or explosion on the highway would probably not endanger the joint element. Likewise, fire within the joint element, although serious because of its relation to the hospital and adjacent housing, would not be of particular concern to the highway. Access to the joint element for fire fighting equipment would be by city streets.

SUMMARY

The application process for this joint development project has been in four stages. Each stage resulted in commitment to the idea, if not agreement, between the King County Design Commission and the Department of Highways. The four stages consisted of the idea, the development of a program, the schematic design phase, and the final design phase.

This joint development project accomplishes two results. First, the provision of adequate parking for Harborview Hospital. Current parking is on the site, but the area is inadequate and the land unimproved. The multi-level parking structure will solve that problem. The second result is the provision of a view park that will provide the public and ambulatory hospital patients access to one of the finest views of downtown Seattle available.

INTER-IM MULTIPURPOSE CENTER

General Discussion

This joint development plan was developed by Inter-Im (The International District Improvement Association), a well-regarded, non-profit citizens' organization, on behalf of the local Chinese, Japanese, and Filipino community. The plan consists of providing a paved area under the freeway structure in Chinatown, between King and Jackson streets, to which Inter-Im would add kiosks, plantings, phones, a sitting park, and other amenities. During the Chinese, Japanese, and Filipino holidays, the area would serve as a meeting place where people could celebrate their festivals and have large gatherings; during other periods, it would serve as a parking area for people visiting or working in Chinatown. Thus the area would serve the entire Chinese, Japanese, and Filipino community, and help to introduce the different ethnic groups to the customs of the other groups.

The Chinese leader of Inter-Im said that this project had for the first time brought the different ethnic groups together to work as a community, and that the three groups were successfully cooperating with each other. During the time the study team was in the organization office, several Japanese, Filipino, and Chinese people came into the office and talked about the proposal. They were all strongly in favor of it.

The cost to the Department of Highways for nominal improvement of the area is estimated at \$54,000. Inter-Im expects to be able to maintain and keep up the parking lot but doubts that the community can afford to pay any rent. The community leaders feel that since the community "lost" several restaurants and gas stations when the freeway was constructed

several years ago, the community should now be able to "gain" a free parking and congregation area. Also, the Department of Highways will be freed of its present maintenance responsibilities for the area.

Alternatives and Conclusions

An alternative to this proposal would be to lease the area, as some similar areas are already leased, to a private parking entrepreneur for commercial parking. This would probably be financially attractive if the domed Seattle stadium is located nearby as presently planned, although the area is probably larger than needed at present for added parking in the vicinity. However, there would be much lower community benefits in this case.

The research team therefore recommends that the Inter-Im proposal be approved and that the lease cost to Inter-Im be minimal so that they can afford to proceed with their contemplated plans. This joint development represents a perfect example of the kind of project that can help to develop and integrate a community and one that should receive as much support as possible, especially since the proposal originated in the community. It is essential to the success of the plan that State actions on paving the area be closely coordinated with Inter-Im's plans for further development of the space.

JDP PROPOSAL IDENTIFICATION FORM

Short Title INTER-IM MULTIPURPOSE CENTER JDP classification(s) P-1 P-2 PG-1

Proposed Location I-5 Between King and Jackson Streets

Originated By International District Improvement Assoc. Project No. 7-554
 (Applicant or highway department's originator)

<u>COSPONSORSHIP</u>	<u>DEFINITE</u>	<u>POSSIBLE</u>	<u>AGENCY OR CONTACT</u>
Federal	()	()	
Other State	()	()	
Local (inc. special district)	()	()	
Private	()	()	
Other (Neighborhood Assoc)	()	(✓)	<u>Inter-Im</u>

ACTIONS REQUIRED (check as many as are believed to be applicable)

Planning (physical) coordination	(✓)	Airspace lease	(✓)
Community interaction	(✓)	Franchised operator's agreement	()
Design integration	()	Franchise agreement (utility)	()
Construction accommodation	()	Encroachment permit	()
Maintenance or operating agreement	(✓)	Surplus property sale	()
Land acquisition coordination	()	Development of other state properties (within highway corridor)	()

SPATIAL DESIGNATION (relation of joint element to the highway facility)

Airspace () Groundspace (✓) Below-ground () Outside R/W ()

LAND TENURE CLASSIFICATION (joint element as related to highway right of way)

I Within normal R/W	(✓)	III On expanded R/W	()
II On Excess property	()	IV On adjacent public property	()
		V On adjacent private property	()

TIMING DISTINCTION

Permanent joint use (✓) Pre-highway construction () Post construction (✓)
 Temporary joint use (✓) Concurrent construction ()

See reverse side for information noted for file purposes.

BASIC POLICY ANALYSIS SUMMARY

Project No. 7-551

Question No. and Key Words (Refer to <u>Section 4 for full question and notations</u>)		Yes	No	Not Applicable
(conceptual)				
1	CONCEPT	SS	()	
2	DEFINITION	SS	()	
3	JDP TYPE	SS	()	
4	FEDERAL POLICY	SS	()	()
5	AUTHORITY	SS	()	
(operational)				
6	TRAFFIC AND FUNCTION	()	SS	
7	HEALTH AND SAFETY	SS	()	
8	LIABILITY	()	SS*	
(community oriented)				
9	GOALS AND OBJECTIVES	SS	()	
10	LOCAL NEED	SS	()	
11	NEIGHBORHOOD COMPATIBILITY	SS	()	
12	LOCATION	SS	()	
13	ALTERNATE JD USES	SS	()	
14	LOCAL APPROVAL	SS	()	()
15	LOCAL APPROVAL (if #14 is negative)	()	()	SS
16	PUBLIC OPINION	SS	()	
(cosponsorship)				
17	COSPONSOR AUTHORITY	SS	()	()
18	COSPONSOR FINANCIAL CAPACITY	()	SS	
19	DEPARTMENT SPONSORSHIP	()	SS*	()
20	FUTURE COSPONSOR	SS*	()	()
(right-of-way)				
21	ORIGINAL PURPOSE	SS	()	()
22	PUBLIC USE	()	()	SS
23	PROPERTY RESTRICTION	SS	()	
24	EXCESS PROPERTY	()	()	SS

Total Affirmative(17)

Total Negative (4)

* Recent information indicates that the WSDH proposed lease to Inter-Im is only for 2 years and the issue of sole sponsorship by the WSDH may be at question--either near term or at some time in the future.

GENERAL CRITERIA ANALYSIS SUMMARY

JD Project No. <u>7-554</u> Completed by <u>SRI Team</u>		Date <u>November 1971</u>
<u>Subsection and Criterion Title</u>	<u>Rating*</u>	<u>Comments</u>
5.1 PHYSICAL CONSIDERATIONS		
5.1.1 Future Expansion and Obsolescence		
Expansion options	<u>A</u>	
Obsolescence compatibility	<u>A</u>	
5.1.2 Traffic and Accessibility		
Traffic interference and capacity	<u>Q</u>	<u>Check King St. access and turning movements</u>
Access need	<u>NA</u>	<u>None required</u>
Access spacing and control	<u>NA</u>	
Ramp capacity when access is direct	<u>NA</u>	
Peak-traffic conflicts	<u>A</u>	
Local street circulation patterns	<u>NA</u>	<u>King to Jackson St. not permitted</u>
Pedestrian conflicts	<u>Q</u>	<u>Pedestrian traffic control during festivals, etc.</u>
5.1.3 Safety and Health		
Safety impairment	<u>A</u>	
Air quality control	<u>Q</u>	
Noise levels and sound control	<u>Q</u>	<u>For some activities</u>
Vibration	<u>A</u>	
Public health aspects	<u>A</u>	
5.1.4 Structural		
Lateral loads (seismic)	<u>NA</u>	
Highway vehicle impact	<u>NA</u>	
Subsurface load increases	<u>NA</u>	
Excavations and structural integrity	<u>NA</u>	
Highway structure attachments	<u>Q</u>	<u>Check final plans</u>
Falling objects, spillage, side-casting and snow-melt	<u>Q</u>	<u>Shielding between overhead structures?</u>
5.1.5 Aesthetics		
Physical scale	<u>A</u>	
Visual amenity	<u>A</u>	
Building appearance and siting	<u>NA</u>	

* Key to Ratings on page 2 of Worksheet 82

Worksheet 3 (Continued)

<u>Subsection and Criterion Title</u>	<u>Rating*</u>	<u>Comments</u>
5.1.6 Screening and Fencing		
Visual screening	Q	Check final plans
Object retention or deflection (accidental or intentional)	A	
Restraint fencing	NA	Already exists
5.1.7 Illumination		
Driver safety	NA	
Surveillance and crime	Q	
Aesthetics	Q	
5.1.8 Signing		
Demonstration of need	A	Needed for "Multi-
Design and location	Q	Purpose Center"
5.1.9 Utilities		
Location and installation (JD projects)	NA	
Appurtenances ancillary to JD	NA	
Attachment to JD structures	NA	
5.1.10 Clearance		
Minimums by cognizant authority	A	
Special JD considerations	Q	Reverberation effects for some activities
5.1.11 Maintenance		
Impairment to highway element	A	
Impairment to joint element	A	
Hazardous conditions	A	
5.1.12 Construction		
Construction coordination	NA	
Labor relations	NA	
5.1.13 Fire and Associated Protection(expllosion)		
Protection of joint element	A	
Protection of highway element	Q	

* Key to Ratings: A = Criterion is adequately met
Q = Some question exists as to whether the criterion is met
U = JD performance is unfavorable in relation to criterion
NA = Criterion not applicable to this project.

Worksheet 3 (Concluded)

<u>Subsection and Criterion Title</u>	<u>Rating*</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<u>5.2 ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS</u>		
5.2.1 Evidence of Demand		
Public uses	<u>A</u>	
Private uses	<u>NA</u>	
5.2.2 Alternative Sites, Uses, or Scales		
Site	<u>A</u>	
Use	<u>A</u>	
Scale	<u>A</u>	
5.2.3 Site and Spillover Effects	<u>A</u>	<u>No significant effects</u>
Local government costs and tax revenues	↓	
Property value changes		
Employment		
Employment versus unemployment		
Personal and business income		
Retail sales		
Price quantity changes in low income housing markets		
Relocation of businesses		
Disruption		
5.2.4 Appraised Value Determination		<u>A</u>
5.2.5 Cosponsor's Financial Capability	<u>Q</u>	
<u>5.3 LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS</u>		
5.3.1 Land Use and Neighborhood Compatibility	<u>A</u>	
5.3.2 Qualification as "Public Use"	<u>NA</u>	
5.3.3 Anti-diversion Amendment Prohibition	<u>A</u>	<u>Saves maintenance expenses</u>
5.3.4 Tortious Liability	<u>Q</u>	<u>WSHD temporary sponsor</u>
5.3.5 Sale or Lease Alternatives	<u>Q</u>	
<u>5.4 SOCIAL CONSIDERATIONS</u>		
5.4.1 Community Needs	<u>A</u>	
5.4.2 Neighborhood Social Conditions	<u>A</u>	
5.4.3 Community Identity	<u>A</u>	
5.4.4 Family Relocation	<u>NA</u>	

INTER-IM MULTIPURPOSE CENTER

The area under the freeway between South Jackson and South King and 8th and 10th Avenues is presently being used unofficially for parking. It has also been used for storing vehicles by a private company in the area. Although there is adequate parking in the immediate area (the adjacent apartments and restaurants have their own lots), this area offers free parking for the entire Chinatown area. The existing plan by the highway department would pave the area for parking but would provide little else that the Interim group has suggested. With the proposed plan, the space would be usable for band practices as requested by "Interim", however, it would have few amenities to encourage community activity as suggested in the original proposal of a "multipurpose area for public events, small park, facilities for holiday and festivals, kiosks (phone, newspapers), band practice, and possible busstop".

As a joint use, this is not a typical case, since rarely will one find a community with such specialized needs. The freeway took much of Chinatown's land, and divided the remaining community. Because of its location within the city, there is no opportunity for expansion. Consequently, the community has become so deprived for space, that it is willing to use anything available, which also exemplifies the oriental frugal use of materials and space. Because of these very specialized needs, the community should be allowed optimal voice in the development of the space under the freeway. The development of a parking lot by the highway department is not adequate to satisfy the needs of the community.

Eckbo, Dean, Austin & Williams

Jones & Jones

INTER-IM MULTIPURPOSE CENTER

TRAFFIC AND ACCESSIBILITY

No direct access from the highway is contemplated and none is warranted. The joint development project is community oriented rather than highway oriented. Vehicular access to the joint development project is from King Street only. There are two reasons for this arrangement. First, Jackson Street to the north is a much busier street than King Street, making King Street the logical choice from the standpoint of the least amount of disruption to surrounding traffic. The second reason for not providing access from Jackson Street as well is to keep motorists from using the joint element as a method of going from Jackson Street to King Street.

The joint development project, as a parking lot, should not create undue disturbance to the traffic pattern of surrounding streets. As a matter of fact, it is expected that the provision of additional parking in this area would benefit the capacity of the surrounding streets, as considerable illegal parking has been observed due to a general parking shortage in the area. The main traveled way, Jackson Street, is unaffected by the joint development project while King Street, from which ingress and egress is made, has relatively light travel. Access to the joint development project could be simplified by eliminating parking from the north side of King Street. This should certainly be considered if the joint development project parking lot is free or city metered parking. Removal of street parking might be questioned, however, for a commercial parking lot.

The joint development project as a combined public parking and community activity center would probably be used for public parking, at least during business hours. Should its use as an activity center attract a large number of people during normal business hours, traffic congestion would probably occur. The congestion could be somewhat relieved if the people could arrive and depart on busses that would unload and load off the streets.

The joint element is readily available to pedestrians as all streets in the expected service area have sidewalks.

STRUCTURAL

Due to the nature of the proposed community activities and the likelihood of large gatherings of people in the joint element, consideration should be given to shielding the joint element from objects falling from the highway above. No other structural concerns seem to exist with this proposal.

SCREENING AND FENCING

The only screening contemplated at this point is a chain link fence on the east and west right-of-way lines that will keep vehicles within the joint development site. Consideration to alternate forms of vehicle control might be contemplated so that the space could be more flexibly utilized as an activity center.

The highway overpass structure acts as a visual screen between the joint development project and the traveled way. Highway noise is muffled somewhat so that the noise level is within acceptable limits, at least for a parking lot.

ILLUMINATION

The joint development project is to be illuminated by luminaires mounted on columns throughout the parking area. They are mounted on the columns with small expansion bolts which shouldn't affect the column's load carrying capacity. This is absolutely essential, especially if the JDP is to be used at night. This rather large, well lit area should provide a sense of security for the users of not only the JDP but the surrounding area.

SIGNING

Signing for the JDP will depend upon its ultimate use. As a commercial parking facility, it will probably have only on-site signing. As a community activity center, directional signs from the surrounding area might be appropriate. In either case, signs directing the motorist from the highway element overhead would not be appropriate.

CLEARANCE

Clearance above grade to the underside of the overpass structure is sufficient for a parking lot operation. The overpass structure gives the appearance of being low because of the large area covered. It may, in fact, be somewhat close to grade for community oriented activities, such as marching bands practicing and public rallies, as the structure might contain and deflect back the noise from such activities unless acoustical material was applied to the underside of the elevated structure.

MAINTENANCE

This joint development project is advantageous to the Department of Highways because it relieves them of the responsibility of maintaining approximately one square block of land. As far as maintenance of the highway element is concerned, the Department of Highways has easy access to the highway overpass structure because of the open nature of the joint element below.

CONSTRUCTION

As the joint element is being constructed beneath existing overpass structures, no construction difficulties are foreseen that affect the highway element.

FIRE AND ASSOCIATED PROTECTION (EXPLOSION)

The highway overpass structure protects the joint development project from all but the most catastrophic events on the highway element.

As a parking lot or a community activity center, the joint element is likely to be exposed to potentially flammable situations. These include the most obvious of automobiles burning. Any fire on the joint element could be easily controlled by fire fighting equipment approaching from either adjacent street.

SUMMARY

This joint development project is quite interesting in that the joint sponsor is the Department of Highways in the initial stage of construction. The Department of Highways is making basic improvements to the site; i.e., paving, drainage, and illumination. The Department will then lease the facility to a leasee in an improved condition, thereby attracting a higher lease income. The leasee will then become the joint sponsor.

CONNECTICUT STREET INTERCHANGE

General Discussion

This proposal is for use of the area south of the Charles Street Service Center for employee parking and for the possible use of a triangular section of land off Airport Way for parking Seattle Transit's buses. The site is in a heavily industrialized area and will eventually be passed over by westerly extensions of the freeway ramps.

Alternatives and Conclusions

The principal alternative here is the "do-nothing" case, of leaving the area in landscaped open space maintained by the Department of Highways. Analysis of the site suggests that this do-nothing alternative is preferable (see EDAW/JJ statement), at least for the triangular area that had been considered for bus storage. This judgment is less clear for the employee parking area, which is more remote from Airport Way and could be successfully screened by plantings if the City is willing to maintain them, as well as to keep the area devoted to parking to a minimum.

The foregoing conclusions are based on a relatively hypothetical situation for purposes of "Guideline" study and JDP analyses of differing types. (It is realized, as a practical matter, that the City currently has a valid lease on the space for parking purposes, that maintenance is presumably already their responsibility, and the likelihood of bus parking actually occurring is remote.)

Worksheet 1

JDP PROPOSAL IDENTIFICATION FORM

Short Title Connecticut Street Interchange JDP classification(s) PG-1, S-1.

Proposed Location South of Charles St. Center, East of Airport Way

Originated By City of Seattle Project No. 7-518
 (Applicant or highway department's originator)

<u>COSPONSORSHIP</u>	<u>DEFINITE</u>	<u>POSSIBLE</u>	<u>AGENCY OR CONTACT</u>
Federal	()	()	
Other State	()	()	
Local (inc. special district)	(<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.	(<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2.	<u>1. Department of Engineering</u> <u>2. Seattle Transit System</u>
Private	()	()	
Other	()	()	

ACTIONS REQUIRED (check as many as are believed to be applicable)

Planning (physical) coordination	(<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>)	Airspace lease	(<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>)
Community interaction	(<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>)	Franchised operator's agreement	()
Design integration	(<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>)	Franchise agreement (utility)	()
Construction accommodation	(<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>)	Encroachment permit	()
Maintenance or operating agreement	(<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>)	Surplus property sale	()
Land acquisition coordination	()	Development of other state properties (within highway corridor)	()

SPATIAL DESIGNATION (relation of joint element to the highway facility)

Airspace () Groundspace () Below-ground () Outside R/W ()

LAND TENURE CLASSIFICATION (joint element as related to highway right of way)

I Within normal R/W	(<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>)	III On expanded R/W	()
II On Excess property	()	IV On adjacent public property	()
		V On adjacent private property	()

TIMING DISTINCTION

Permanent joint use () Pre-highway construction () Post construction (in part)
 Temporary joint use () Concurrent construction ()

See reverse side for information noted for file purposes.

OTHER INFORMATION:

Estimated cost to highway department

\$ -0-

Sources: (1) Federal \$ _____
(2) State highway fund \$ _____
(3) _____ \$ _____

Estimated cost to cosponsor(2)

\$ _____

Sources: (1) _____ \$ _____
(2) _____ \$ _____
(3) _____ \$ _____

Size of joint development project _____ (acres)

Amount of highway land or airspace involved in JDP _____ (acres)

If airspace, state any vertical limits to be specified _____ (ft)
[If unlimited as to height, check here ()]

Appraised value of State's portion of land or airspace
proposed to be utilized by the proposed project. \$ _____

OTHER COMMENTS:

City of Seattle had at one time proposed using part of the subject site
for building expansion of the Charles Street Center; as this would require
a new lease and a possible rental charge, the idea was dropped.

BASIC POLICY ANALYSIS SUMMARY

Question No. and Key Words (Refer to Section 4 for full question and notations)		Yes	No	Not Applicable
(conceptual)				
1	CONCEPT	(X)	()	
2	DEFINITION	(X)	()	
3	JDP TYPE	(X)	()	
4	FEDERAL POLICY	(X)	()	()
5	AUTHORITY	(X)	()	
(operational)				
6	TRAFFIC AND FUNCTION	(X)	()	
7	HEALTH AND SAFETY	(X)	()	
8	LIABILITY	(X)	()	
(community oriented)				
9	GOALS AND OBJECTIVES	()	(X)	
10	LOCAL NEED	()	(X)	
11	NEIGHBORHOOD COMPATIBILITY	(X)	()	
12	LOCATION	(X)	()	
13	ALTERNATE JD USES	()	(X)	
14	LOCAL APPROVAL	(X)	()	()
15	LOCAL APPROVAL (if #14 is negative)	()	()	(X)
16	PUBLIC OPINION	()	(X)	
(cosponsorship)				
17	COSPONSOR AUTHORITY	(X)	()	()
18	COSPONSOR FINANCIAL CAPACITY	()	(X)	
19	DEPARTMENT SPONSORSHIP	()	()	(X)
20	FUTURE COSPONSOR	()	()	(X)
(right-of-way)				
21	ORIGINAL PURPOSE	(X)	()	()
22	PUBLIC USE	()	()	(X)
23	PROPERTY RESTRICTION	(X)	()	
24	EXCESS PROPERTY	()	()	(X)
Total Affirmative		(14)		
Total Negative			(5)	

GENERAL CRITERIA ANALYSIS SUMMARY

- JD Project No. <u>7-518</u> Completed by <u>SRI Team</u> Date <u>November 1971</u>		
<u>Subsection and Criterion Title</u>	<u>Rating*</u>	<u>Comments</u>
5.1 <u>PHYSICAL CONSIDERATIONS</u>		
5.1.1 Future Expansion and Obsolescence		
Expansion options	<u>Q</u>	<u>Effect on westerly freeway extensions</u>
Obsolescence compatibility	<u>A</u>	
5.1.2 Traffic and Accessibility		
Traffic interference and capacity	<u>Q</u>	<u>Only when fully utilized and/or bus storage</u>
Access need	<u>NA</u>	<u>None required</u>
Access spacing and control	<u>NA</u>	
Ramp capacity when access is direct	<u>NA</u>	
Peak-traffic conflicts	<u>A</u>	
Local street circulation patterns	<u>NA</u>	
Pedestrian conflicts	<u>A</u>	
5.1.3 Safety and Health		
Safety impairment	<u>A</u>	
Air quality control	<u>A</u>	
Noise levels and sound control	<u>A</u>	
Vibration	<u>A</u>	
Public health aspects	<u>A</u>	
5.1.4 Structural		
Lateral loads (seismic)	<u>NA</u>	
Highway vehicle impact	<u>Q</u>	<u>Future column locations</u>
Subsurface load increases	<u>NA</u>	
Excavations and structural integrity	<u>NA</u>	
Highway structure attachments	<u>NA</u>	
Falling objects, spillage, side-casting and snow-melt	<u>Q</u>	
5.1.5 Aesthetics		
Physical scale	<u>A</u>	
Visual amenity	<u>U</u>	<u>As to bus storage</u>
Building appearance and siting	<u>NA</u>	

* Key to Ratings on page 2 of Worksheet

Worksheet 3 (Continued)

<u>Subsection and Criterion Title</u>	<u>Rating*</u>	<u>Comments</u>
5.1.6 Screening and Fencing		
Visual screening	<u>U</u>	<u>Exposed existing storage</u>
Object retention or deflection (accidental or intentional)	<u>A</u>	<u></u>
Restraint fencing	<u>A</u>	<u>Already exists</u>
5.1.7 Illumination		
Driver safety	<u>A</u>	<u></u>
Surveillance and crime	<u>Q</u>	<u>Check final plans</u>
Aesthetics	<u>Q</u>	<u>" " "</u>
5.1.8 Signing		
Demonstration of need	<u>NA</u>	<u>None required</u>
Design and location	<u>NA</u>	<u></u>
5.1.9 Utilities		
Location and installation (JD projects)	<u>NA</u>	<u></u>
Appurtenances ancillary to JD	<u>NA</u>	<u></u>
Attachment to JD structures	<u>NA</u>	<u></u>
5.1.10 Clearance		
Minimums by cognizant authority	<u>A</u>	<u>Far exceeded</u>
Special JD considerations	<u>A</u>	<u></u>
5.1.11 Maintenance		
Impairment to highway element	<u>A</u>	<u></u>
Impairment to joint element	<u>A</u>	<u></u>
Hazardous conditions	<u>A</u>	<u></u>
5.1.12 Construction		
Construction coordination	<u>Q</u>	<u>Timing of construction?</u>
Labor relations	<u>Q</u>	<u></u>
5.1.13 Fire and Associated Protection(explosion)		
Protection of joint element	<u>A</u>	<u></u>
Protection of highway element	<u>A</u>	<u></u>

<p>* Key to Ratings: A = Criterion is adequately met Q = Some question exists as to whether the criterion is met U = JD performance is unfavorable in relation to criterion NA = Criterion not applicable to this project.</p>

Worksheet 3 (Concluded)

Subsection and Criterion Title	Rating*	Comments
5.2 ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS		
5.2.1 Evidence of Demand		Experience to date
Public uses	Q	does not indicate need
Private uses	NA	
5.2.2 Alternative Sites, Uses, or Scales		Expansion of bus storage
Site	Q	on existing Seattle Trans lot?
Use	U	Need for future open space
Scale	Q	May be more area than needed for employee parking
5.2.3 Site and Spillover Effects	A	No significant effects
Local government costs and tax revenues		
Property value changes		
Employment		
Employment versus unemployment		
Personal and business income		
Retail sales		
Price quantity changes in low income housing markets		
Relocation of businesses		
Disruption		
5.2.4 Appraised Value Determination	A	
5.2.5 Cosponsor's Financial Capability	Q	Based on action to date
5.3 LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS		
5.3.1 Land Use and Neighborhood Compatibility	Q	Future neighborhood needs
5.3.2 Qualification as "Public Use"	NA	
5.3.3 Anti-diversion Amendment Prohibition	NA	
5.3.4 Tortious Liability	Q	
5.3.5 Sale or Lease Alternatives	Q	
5.4 SOCIAL CONSIDERATIONS		
5.4.1 Community Needs	Q	Open space policy?
5.4.2 Neighborhood Social Conditions	A	Opinion of community groups?
5.4.3 Community Identity	Q	
5.4.4 Family Relocation	NA	

CONNECTICUT STREET INTERCHANGE

The existing parking south of the service center (that presently in use) is not particularly objectionable, however, the storage usage off Norman Street is unsightly. If this were fenced and landscaped for parking as indicated in the submitted plans, it would block from view the less desirable storage uses adjacent to it. The remaining portions of land in the interchange area offer the only open green space in the entire vicinity. The interchange at this point, with its unfinished ramps and overpasses is so complicated that the open, flowing green space beneath it is a necessity. Without this even plane, the result would be visually unpleasing, while as is, it achieves almost a sculptural beauty.

Use of the triangular section off Airport Way South for parking buses is out of the question, since even fencing could not adequately camouflage the use, and the area would lose its present visual amenities. Also, access to the proposed bus parking from the station would have to be across Airport Way South, which would create traffic problems.

The best alternate use is to leave the space open, so that it functions visually as a park for the freeway user, driver's on the offramps from the freeway, and drivers on the adjacent arterials.

Eckbo, Dean, Austin & Williams
Jones & Jones

CONNECTICUT STREET INTERCHANGE

TRAFFIC AND ACCESSIBILITY

A direct connection to the highway is not and should not be considered. Ingress to the proposed employee parking lot is from Airport Way, 8th Avenue South, or 9th Avenue South. Egress would be to those three points as well as 7th Avenue South. Because several sources of ingress and egress are available, the proposed employee parking lot should not adversely affect the local traffic patterns. The parking lot will serve employees of the adjacent maintenance shops which are already in operation. Presumably, these employees are already parking in the area, many on the site of the proposed parking lot.

Pedestrian movements from the parking area to the worker's destinations in the Charles Street Maintenance Center should pose no problems, as sidewalks exist and no major arterials need be crossed.

STRUCTURAL

This potential joint development project site, consisting of a relatively large open area with separate highway overpass structures placed some distance apart and high above the ground, would be well suited for one or two story buildings, if a need for such could be demonstrated. On the other hand, the need for parking space is already being demonstrated by the fact that people are parking on a small portion of the site.

Regardless of the joint element use, the columns supporting the elevated interchange must be protected from damage from vehicular traffic on the ground.

SCREENING AND FENCING

One plan for the employee parking lot shows a screen fence and landscaping separating the parking lot from Airport Way and the connection between Connecticut Street and 9th Avenue South. This sort of screening has little to do with joint development; rather, it is a function of the design of the parking lot. Such screening is highly desirable from an aesthetic standpoint, regarding the passing traffic on adjacent streets.

ILLUMINATION

This joint element can be illuminated without much effect on the vertically separated highway element. Illumination, if any, should probably be for security purposes.

SIGNING

Since this facility is employee parking for City personnel, the only signing which seems appropriate would be restrictive in nature.

CLEARANCE

The joint element grade will be located in accordance with the existing grade on adjacent city streets. The joint element has a greater relationship with the city streets; that is, Connecticut Street and Airport Way, than it does with the Connecticut Street Interchange. There is a considerable vertical distance between the ground and the ramp overpass structures. Also, the overpass structures are relatively far apart, with large areas of air space between. All of this makes the ground seem more like open space than space under an elevated highway. Clearance as such is not an issue with this proposal.

MAINTENANCE

The maintenance of the ground surface of the highway right-of-way beneath this elevated interchange has relieved the Department of Highways of the responsibility of maintaining the area. This illustrates one of the possible positive benefits of joint development to the Highway Department. Because the joint element is a parking lot, maintenance of the highway element above should not be any more difficult than if the ground was undeveloped.

CONSTRUCTION

The proposal at hand presents no construction problems. At the time that the ramps to the west are extended and the Connecticut Street connection to Alaskan Way is constructed, considerable conflict with the operation of these lots will occur. It is conceivable that the areas utilized by this joint element would have normally been made available to the contractor for staging areas, etc., so that the Connecticut Street future contract may in fact be somewhat higher than if these areas were not utilized.

If the City occupies these lots during the future overhead construction, then the necessary falsework, safety devices, etc., to protect them will certainly add to the cost of the Connecticut Street project.

FIRE AND ASSOCIATED PROTECTION (EXPLOSION)

The surrounding city streets provide numerous means of access for fire fighting equipment to the joint element. This fact along with the interchange's relatively high elevation above ground would render the interchange somewhat immune to damage by fire originating at the joint element. As with most joint elements located beneath highway overpass structures, this joint element would be endangered only by catastrophic events on the highway element.

SUMMARY

As of this date (February 1972), the City does not have sufficient funds to implement the joint development project, therefore, progress is at a standstill. Joint use is not at a standstill, however, because employees of the maintenance shops are parking on the site. The site is being used, but not to its potential. The employee parking lot is probably 50 to 100 percent oversized at this point in anticipation of new maintenance shops for the service center in the future.

This potential joint use site is interesting for two reasons. First of all, it is the only site studied where the joint element may be constructed prior to the highway element. Secondly, the site is rather large, open, and well served by adjacent streets.

Consideration might be given to the northeast corner of Airport Way and Connecticut Street as a building site. This piece of ground is apparently not being considered as employee parking. It had previously been considered by the Seattle Transit System. Seattle Transit planned employee parking but dropped the idea because of the excessive cost of landscaping and other improvements. Later, in 1968, when Seattle Transit thought it would lose its bus parking near Seattle Center to the domed stadium, they considered parking buses temporarily on the Connecticut Street intersection site. That idea was abandoned when the domed stadium site was changed to King Street.

The highway overpass structures have not been built over it, so common supports could be used for the highway element and the joint element. Provided a need could be established for a building, it would take advantage of the two unique features of this site referred to previously.