


February 10, 2011

TO: Sound Transit Board Capital Committee

FROM: Ron Endlich 
North Link Deputy Project Director

SUBJECT: Public Outreach Feedback on Brooklyn Station Design Options

After two design options for Brooklyn Station were presented to the Capital Committee on January 13, 2011, the North Link project team sought to inform and receive input from local stakeholders, property owners and community members before identifying a preferred design option to advance to 30% design completion. This memo summarizes the comments Sound Transit received to date on the Brooklyn Station design options.

Methods of Outreach

Project staff contacted a number of University District stakeholders and property owners by phone or e-mail to inform them about the Brooklyn Station design options and invite them to the January 27, 2011 public open house on the subject.

Sound Transit staff hosted a two-hour public open house that included a presentation and question and answer session on January 27, 2011 at University Heights Center, 5031 University Way NE, Seattle. The open house was advertised by postcard, newspaper ads, notices to North Link e-mail distribution lists, the Sound Transit web site, and posted notices in the University District.

Project staff also met in person with University of Washington representatives, the Executive Director of the Greater University Chamber of Commerce, and the owner of the Neptune Theatre and a Seattle Theatre Group representative.

Community Feedback at Public Meeting

More than 150 people attended the January 27th open house. Open house attendees asked questions and provided comments about Brooklyn Station both verbally and in writing. Sound Transit also received comments via e-mail.

People attending the meeting appeared to be very supportive of transit improvements in general and constructing the Link light rail station in the University District in particular. Few people at the open house or via e-mail expressed a strong preference for either Option 1, the Modified PE design or Option 2, the Single Entrance design option. The opinions of those who did express a preference were split roughly evenly between the two options. Many other attendees appeared to support either option.

Those who favored Option 1 cited a preference for two entrances because of better access, better visibility of the station entrances, better connections to buses, and better pedestrian security. Those who favored

Option 2 cited lower costs, lower construction risk and better, more direct access to the station platform, especially for disabled patrons.

Regardless of the design option selected, many people expressed interest in promoting good pedestrian and bicycle access to the station and easy connections to buses. Several people offered ideas for the redevelopment of Sound Transit property and Brooklyn Avenue post-construction.

An article about the January 27th open house appeared on the Seattle Transit Blog and generated over 200 responses from about 40 commenters. Several commenters expressed a strong preference for Option 1 with a few supporting Option 2. The reasons for favoring one design option over the other were similar to those described above.

Other Stakeholder Feedback

Some of the property owners and business owners who were contacted expressed no preference between the two design options. A few preferred Option 2. Those favoring Option 2 cited fewer impacts to businesses during construction and easier, more direct access to the station platform. Regardless of the design option selected, property and business owners expressed concern about noise during construction.

University of Washington staff said they were neutral on the options. Maintaining convenient pedestrian access to the UW Tower during construction and long-term development around the station after its completion are major interests of UW staff.

c. Ahmad Fazel
Don Davis
Brooke Belman