

Executive Summary

Sound Transit recently decided where the stations will be located along the “North Link” extension of the planned light rail system, which includes the Roosevelt Neighborhood. In light of that decision, the Roosevelt Neighborhood Association (RNA) took it upon themselves to encourage and begin a thorough process of Station Area Planning (SAP).

After consulting with members of the city council, it was decided that since any community planning must be in accordance with the area’s neighborhood plan (“Tomorrow’s Roosevelt”), The Plan will need to be updated to accommodate the details of the transit station, and to include corrections of any other details which have become inaccurate since the original publication of The Plan in 1998.

A team was formed in April 2005 to assess The Plan. Team members consisted of RNA Members, Roosevelt residents and Roosevelt business owners and employees. A roster of these team members is included in **Appendix A – Team Roster**.

The assessment progressed under Andy Reay-Ellers' leadership. In addition to utilizing the whole team during the assessment process, three sub-teams were formed to provide detailed assessments. The following steps have been taken to assess The Plan:

1. The three sub-teams met independently to comment on The Plan. Comments were shared and evaluated by the whole team.
2. The whole team met to evaluate each paragraph of Section **II. Plan Elements**. Each paragraph was rated for revisions that might be needed and ranked for the level of importance for its need to be revised.
3. The three sub-teams met independently to consider how Section **II. Plan Elements** needed to be revised to address the issues raised during previous assessment work. Again, this information was shared and evaluated by the whole team.
4. A new sub-group was formed to create a summary of the assessments that have been completed so far and to pin-point portions of The Plan specifically impacted by the light rail station that must be considered during Station Area Planning. This document is that summary.

Roosevelt Neighborhood Plan Re-Visioning Team
Existing Plan Assessment (with Station Area Planning Focus)

The strongest comment that can be made about The Plan as it now exists is that it does not adequately identify what is needed for Station Area Planning. While The Plan states that “the community supports an underground light rail station in the business core,” it does not address the location of the station or how the station might be integrated into the community. This is primarily due to the fact that when The Plan was written, multiple station locations were being considered by Sound Transit.

A neighborhood plan should be used to guide a neighborhood when making decisions that will affect its future. That plan must take a holistic view of all of the components that make up a neighborhood. It must contain strategies for addressing the needs of the neighborhood’s residents, tenants and guests.

A neighborhood plan is a less effective tool if, due to changes in the community, it becomes inaccurate, out-of-date, or incomplete. There have been a number of unanticipated changes since the publication of “Tomorrow’s Roosevelt,” but certainly none will have bigger ramifications than the proposed transit station. When a light rail station is introduced to a neighborhood the relationships of nearly all the neighborhood’s components will most certainly change.

Given that we now know the alignment of the light rail and the location of the station entrances, we must be armed with a plan that will help guide Station Area Planning. Based on the results of the assessment work completed so far, the team has concluded that The Plan needs to be thoroughly revisited and revised.

The team has sought and received tentative approval for matching funds through the Department of Neighborhoods’ “Small + Simple” grant Program. These funds will serve to provide the team with the professional consultation and assistance necessary to properly undertake the process of thoroughly revising “Tomorrow’s Roosevelt.” This effort shall re-create the existing plan into a document that will truly meet the needs of Tomorrow’s Roosevelt.

Assessment Summaries

The Roosevelt Neighborhood has taken a close look at “Tomorrow’s Roosevelt” in order to assess The Plan’s accuracy in general and its directions regarding Station Area Planning specifically. The existing plan has many shortcomings and fails to provide adequate guidance for the coming station-related changes. This section summarizes the findings from the assessments completed thus far.

Overall Comments

Three sub-teams met to comment on each of the three main sections of The Plan. When the whole team met to review each sub-team’s comments, several themes began to emerge. The following four sections highlight those themes.

- **Outdated**

Several sections of The Plan are outdated.

For instance, although the Roosevelt High School renovation is in progress and scheduled for completion in 2006, The Plan proposes that the community help work on the design of the renovation. The section entitled “Light Rail Station” merely states the neighborhood’s preference of station location. The location now chosen was not even under consideration at the time of The Plan’s creation.

Other outdated items include: incorrectly defined neighborhood boundaries (they were altered in 2003), maps that don’t include the proposed station location, out-of-date photos, old population and traffic data, details of the new school site alignment and economic development changes.

- **Unrealistic ideas**

Some of the ideas in The Plan, which may have sounded great at the time, have no realistic strategy for implementation. Examples include: façade improvements and retaining an ombudsman -- neither idea was supported by any suggestion of how to finance such proposals.

- **Nonspecific and missing details**

Some of The Plan contains elements that were missing details. For example, the section on the light rail station does not address interrelated issues such as parking and arterial traffic.

Other areas of The Plan were not specific and neglected some aspects of possible solutions. For instance, there is a lot of focus on pedestrians and how to make safer street crossings. However, there is no mention of bicycles and how bike lanes can create a narrower street crossing.

- **Ideas not pursued**

Some of the ideas were not pursued. In light of the changes that are likely to occur due to the rail station, several of these ideas need to be revisited and revised. Examples include: Roosevelt Chamber of Commerce, Village Center Plaza (the site is now a 6-story building), Identity for Gateways and street treatments.

It is worth noting that The Plan's proposals for art walks and a neighborhood festival were successfully met and continue to be considered important by the team.

Rating and Ranking

The whole team met to rate each portion of Section II. **Plan Elements** for revisions that might be necessary. These revisions were then ranked according to the importance of the proposed revisions. And finally, each piece was evaluated for how it might be impacted by the need to execute Station Area Planning.

For the most part, pieces were either delineated by a heading or were photos or diagrams. Broken down this way there were a total of 117 pieces.

A few key examples of the sections impacted by Station Area Planning are included below.

- Pages 24 thru 26 discuss the "Commercial Core." Since the rail station is located in the commercial core, this section needs significant revision and is considered to be directly impacted by Station Area Planning.
- Page 34 discusses the "Neighborhood Identity," The pieces of this section are considered to be both directly and indirectly impacted by Station Area Planning.
- Pages 46 thru 50 discuss the topic of "Transportation" including arterial traffic, parking, pedestrian safety and the light rail station. This topic is directly impacted by Station Area Planning.

Roosevelt Neighborhood Plan Re-Visioning Team
Existing Plan Assessment (with Station Area Planning Focus)

A detailed account of the Rating and Ranking evaluation is included in **Appendix C – Rating and Ranking Results**. The following statistics were generated from those details.

This table represents all 117 pieces in Section II. **Plan Elements**.

| Count of Pieces | Importance | | | | | | Grand Total |
|-----------------|------------|----|----|----|---|-----------|-------------|
| | Rating | A | B | C | D | E (blank) | |
| 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 2 |
| 2 | | 2 | 2 | | | | 4 |
| 3 | | 1 | 5 | 8 | | | 14 |
| 4 | | 12 | 7 | 5 | | | 24 |
| 5 | | 10 | 23 | 7 | 4 | | 45 |
| 6 | | | | | | 2 | 17 |
| (blank) | | | | | | | 9 |
| Grand Total | | 25 | 38 | 21 | 4 | 2 | 27 |

| Ratings | Rankings |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Good as is | A. Highest Importance |
| 2. Good but should be expanded | B. Very Important |
| 3. Slightly out of date | C. Important |
| 4. Mostly out of date | D. Only slight important |
| 5. Completely out of date | E. Unimportant. |
| 6. Unneeded | |

Note that the areas that have strong borders are considered “out of date” and are “important” to one degree or another. These ratings and rankings represent 78 of the pieces which is two-thirds of Section II. **Plan Elements**.

The following table represents the 71 pieces that were considered to be directly impacted by Station Area Planning. There were 12 pieces affected by indirect impact. The remaining for 34 pieces were considered either no impact or were not rated.

| Pieces | Importance | | | | | | Grand Total |
|-------------|------------|----|----|----|---------|---|-------------|
| Rating | A | B | C | D | (blank) | | |
| 1 | | | | 1 | | | 1 |
| 2 | | 2 | 2 | | | | 4 |
| 3 | | 1 | 3 | 5 | | | 9 |
| 4 | | 9 | 7 | 3 | | | 19 |
| 5 | | 10 | 19 | 2 | 3 | | 34 |
| 6 | | | | | | 4 | 4 |
| Grand Total | | 22 | 31 | 11 | 3 | 4 | 71 |

Note that the areas that have strong borders are considered “out of date” and are “important” to one degree or another. These ratings and rankings represent 59 of the 71 pieces (over 80%) of the pieces that are directly impacted by Station Area Planning.

Revision Strategy

Armed with information from prior assessment work, the team has seen the need to thoroughly revisit and revise The Plan, particularly Section **II. Plan Elements**. The Plan fails to present an integrated look at the Roosevelt neighborhood that considers the future light rail station in the commercial core.

Since The Plan must now consider and incorporate light rail, the perspective has changed. Certainly the physical location of the transit station must be integrated into The Plan, but the presence of light rail will, either directly or indirectly, impact all elements of the Roosevelt neighborhood and The Plan as well.

The neighborhood can expect more traffic in terms of the number of commuters that will travel through the neighborhood to access the light rail. The parking pressures will increase as people drive to get closer to the light rail station. And as more people choose to live close to a mass-transit stop, the Roosevelt neighborhood can expect to have more residents.

During the evaluation process, the team identified a number of important themes which revisions to The Plan should address. Those issues include:

- Livability and Sustainability
- Logical Structure of the plan
- Safety and Land use
- Integrating / Cooperation / Networking with Government
- Transportation --*especially light rail*
- Housing
- Diversity
- Economic Development
- Public / Open Spaces
- Character and scale, compl
- ementing existing

Assessment Conclusion

In light of all of these impending impacts, RNA is planning to thoroughly revise The Plan to provide a more holistic view of the neighborhood as it will be. A team of RNA members, Roosevelt residents and Roosevelt business owners and employees has already begun to assess the existing plan and are examining its proper revision.

Funds have been sought, and tentative approval has been granted, to obtain expert resources to assist in developing a plan that will address the needs of Tomorrow's Roosevelt.

Appendix A – Team Roster

Roosevelt Neighborhood Plan Re-Visioning Team

| Name | Representing | address | phone |
|------------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------------|
| Bigelow, Tad | RHS Site Council; Resident | 7520 12 th NE 98115 | 525-7166 |
| Chencharick, Penny | Resident | 801 NE 70 th 98115 | 985-4587 |
| DeAnda, Michele | Whole Foods Market Administrator, resident | 1026 NE 64 th St 98115 | W:985-1500 ext 277 |
| Eckert, David | Chair, Friends of Cowen Park; Resident | 6207 12 th Ave. NE 98115 | 528-4984 |
| Gerbracht, Josh | Pastor, Calvary Christian Assembly | 6801 Roosevelt Way NE | 525 - 7473 |
| Hinds, Shana | Employee, Dwell Roosevelt; resident-to- be | 2801 Alaskan Way suite107 98121 | w: 206-374-0414 cel: 425-737-2203 |
| Jandacka, Jerry | Landlord of Roosevelt area rentals | PO Box 51051 98115 | 522 - 5678 |
| Johnson, Lani | Co-founder, The Johnson Partnership | 1212 NE 65 th 98115 | 523-1618 |
| Norton- Middaugh , Dan | Resident, RHS site Council | 6280 21 st Ave NE 98115 | H: 200-6241 Cell: 524-9964 |
| O'Halloran, Jim | RNA president; P- Patch participant; Resident | 6219 Brooklyn Ave NE 98115 | 523-1770 |
| Reay-Ellers, Andy | RNA Vice-President; Resident | 825 NE 67 th 98115 | 529-1280 |
| Steiner, Bess | RNA secretary; Resident | 6903 12 th Ave NE 98115 | 985-9520 |
| Steiner, Brad | RNA treasurer; Resident | 6903 12 th Ave NE 98115 | 985-9520 |
| Vaughn, Doug | CCA alternate | 8897 Paisley Dr NE | 522-7808 |
| Weers, Randy | Resident | 809 NE 70 th 98115 | 526-2969 423-1250 cell |
| Weinland, Jay | Resident; P-Patch participant | 7018 12 th ave NE 98115 | Cell 818 - 7516 |
| Wiesner, Paul | Resident: Sound Transit Citizen Council | 1352 NE 62 nd 98115 | 523-4313 |

Appendix C – Existing Plan Assessment: Ratings, Rankings, and SAP Impacts

KEY to Table:

- Pg No** location of item in “Tomorrow’s Roosevelt” by page number
- Seq** For pages with multiple items, the order on the page
- Description** Description of the item
- Rate** Rating of accuracy/relevance assigned (see chart on page 5)
- Rank** Ranking of Importance of Item to Neighborhood (see chart on page 5)
- SAP N/D/I** Relation Station Area Planning -- **N**one / **D**irect Impact / **I**ndirect Impact
- SAP Why/How** Explanation of connection to Station Area Planning
- Comments** Specific details noted in assessment done by the whole group on October 10, 2005

| Pg No | Seq | Description | Rate | Rank | SAP N/D/I | SAP Why/How | Comments |
|--------------|------------|-------------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|--|---|
| 16 | 1 | Land Use Economic Development | 1 | C | D | Land use for station | |
| 16 | 2 | Vision | 4 | A | N/A | | Needs to be rewritten |
| 16 | 3 | Existing Conditions | 3 | C | N/A | | Outdated |
| 16 | 4 | Photo | 4 | C | N/A | | Needs to be updated |
| 18 | 1 | Land Use Transitions Goal | 5 | A | D | Zoning and building heights | |
| 18 | 2 | Issues | | | N/A | | Is actually fact that should be removed |
| 18 | 3 | Design Guidelines | 3 | B | D | Design guidelines how to integrate SAP into design | Need revision |

Roosevelt Neighborhood Plan Re-Visioning Team
Existing Plan Assessment (with Station Area Planning Focus)

| Pg | No | Seq | Description | Rate | Rank | SAP N/D/I | SAP Why/How | Comments |
|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|---|---|
| 18 | 4 | | Overlay Zoning | 3 | C | I | Residential areas surrounding commercial area | Delete last phrase |
| 18 | 5 | | Upzoning | 5 | B | D | Impact on zoning with SAP and providing height zones | Hard to read; total rewrite |
| 18 | 6 | | Downzoning | 5 | C | D | Impact on zoning with SAP and providing height zones | |
| 19 | 1 | | Diagram | 5 | B | D | Show boundaries and station location w/ zoning | Neighborhood wrong boundaries and zoning need to be checked |
| 20 | 1 | | Housing Goals | 4 | A | D | Housing issues; affects single family character of neighborhood | 25% Goal, should that be 50% |
| 20 | 2 | | Vision | 4 | A | I | How to maintain single family character near station | |
| 21 | 1 | | Issues | 3 | C | D | Maintain different types of housing opportunities | Poorly written |
| 21 | 2 | | ...New Housing | 2 | B | D | Housing issues similar to above | |
| 21 | 3 | | Housing Affordability | 4 | B | D | Housing issues similar to above | Cities Comprehensive Plan has changed since this plan was written |
| 21 | 4 | | Maintenance | 3 | B | I | More housing speculation may result in area; more pedestrian traffic increase need to and amount of maintenance | Serious problems |
| 21 | 5 | | Photo | | | | | |
| 22 | 1 | | Code Enforcement | 1 | B | N/A | | |

Roosevelt Neighborhood Plan Re-Visioning Team
Existing Plan Assessment (with Station Area Planning Focus)

| Pg No | Seq | Description | Rate | Rank | SAP N/D/I | SAP Why/How | Comments |
|-------|-----|------------------------|------|------|-----------|---|----------------------------|
| 22 | 1 | Code Enforcement | 1 | B | N/A | | |
| 22 | 2 | Working with Landlords | 5 | C | N/A | | Rewritten |
| 22 | 3 | Home Ownership/Maint | 6 | | N/A | | Unrealistic |
| 22 | 4 | Redevelopment | 5 | B | I | Redevelopment plans need to intergrate with what changes due to SAP | |
| 22 | 5 | Contract Zones | 5 | D | I | Contract Zones (like Redevelopment) | |
| 23 | 1 | Diagram | 4 | B | D | Parking; Rezoning; needs update with SAP | Outdated |
| 24 | 1 | Other Zoning Changes | 5 | B | D | Zoning for residential areas with station in place | re-write, fold into others |
| 24 | 2 | Land Purch & Dev. | 6 | E | N/A | | Delete |
| 24 | 3 | Ombudsman | 6 | E | N/A | | Delete |
| 24 | 4 | Commercial Core Goal | 4 | A | D | re-shape bussiness core | |
| 24 | 5 | Vision | 4 | A | D | re-shape bussiness core | re-write |
| 24 | 6 | Issues | 5 | B | D | re-shape bussiness core | |
| 25 | 1 | Diagram | 4 | B | D | re-shape bussiness core | |
| 26 | 1 | Zoning Recommendations | 5 | B | D | Planning for mix use development; particularly within SAP block | |
| 26 | 2 | Pedestrian Core | 2 | A | D | Pedestrian areas around the core and rezoning | |
| 26 | 3 | Pedestrian Overlay | 3 | C | D | Pedestrian traffic flow and link from station to businesses with rezoning | |

Roosevelt Neighborhood Plan Re-Visioning Team
Existing Plan Assessment (with Station Area Planning Focus)

| Pg | No | Seq | Description | Rate | Rank | SAP N/D/I | SAP Why/How | Comments |
|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|---|---|
| 26 | 4 | | Festival | 5 | C | N | | Festival is operational |
| 26 | 5 | | Walking Tour | 6 | | N | | outside of scope of NP |
| 26 | 6 | | Business Welcome package | 6 | | N | | Unrealistic; RNA should do this |
| 26 | 7 | | Place Identity | 5 | C | I | How will the SAP allow deeper identity and how can it be utilized to advertise our identity | |
| 27 | 1 | | Diagram | 4 | C | D | Needs similar update where station entrances will be located | |
| 28 | 1 | | Gateway/Streetscape Treatments | 5 | B | D | station will create a new gateway | not all gateways are identified. Signage from bottom of freeway is illegal. |
| 28 | 2 | | Commercial Pedestrian Environment | 4 | B | D | Station will be at core of commercial environment | Realistic? |
| 29 | 1 | | Diagram | 5 | B | D | Include new gateway | not all getways identified |
| 30 | 1 | | Façade Improvement Program | 5 | D | I | Store front improvement; how will SAP integrate with other building fronts | 3 other groups are funded for this kind of thing |
| 30 | 2 | | Photo | | | N/A | | Photo |
| 30 | 3 | | Planning for Sound Transit | 5 | A | D | The neighborhood design guidelines need to be considered in SAP | Station decisions have been changed |

Roosevelt Neighborhood Plan Re-Visioning Team
Existing Plan Assessment (with Station Area Planning Focus)

| Pg No | Seq | Description | Rate | Rank | SAP N/D/I | SAP Why/How | Comments |
|-------|-----|----------------------------|------|------|-----------|--|--|
| 31 | 1 | Diagram | 5 | B | D | The neighborhood design guidelines need to be considered in SAP | " |
| 32 | 1 | Urban Design | 3 | C | D | The urban design should be considered with Light rail in the mix | re-write |
| 32 | 2 | Vision | 4 | A | D | See above; this is how we want it | re-write |
| 32 | 3 | Existing Conditions | 5 | B | N/A | This is a statement of how things are | number count off, bike lanes, HS |
| 33 | 1 | Diagram | 4 | B | D | Upgrade to include station locations | boundaries changed/ not all traffic documented |
| 34 | 1 | Neighborhood Identity Goal | 4 | B | D | Light rail will be a part of the neighborhood identity and should allow the neighborhood to express its identity | |
| 34 | 2 | Issue | 6 | | D | Same as above | re=write |
| 34 | 3 | Streetscape Treatments | 3 | C | I | Same as above | |
| 34 | 4 | Gateway Features | 4 | C | D | Same as above | reference # wrong. Not all gtways identified |
| 34 | 5 | Public Art | 3 | C | D | Same as above | public art in station area? |
| 34 | 6 | Illustration | 6 | | N/A | | change/redesign |
| 35 | 1 | Diagram | 4 | C | D | Station is new gateway for our identity | update |

Roosevelt Neighborhood Plan Re-Visioning Team
Existing Plan Assessment (with Station Area Planning Focus)

| Pg No | Seq | Description | Rate | Rank | SAP N/D/I | SAP Why/How | Comments |
|-------|-----|------------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--|--|
| 36 | 1 | Pedestrian Environment Goal | 5 | A | D | Station increases number of peds / bikes; SAP should consider this | does not include bike lane/ planning. Add signal timing. |
| 36 | 2 | Issues | 2 | A | D | Same as above | does not include the triangle |
| 36 | 3 | Recommend: Curb Bulbs | 5 | B | D | Same as above | SDOT conversations/paint curbs |
| 36 | | Illustration | | | N/A | | illustration |
| 37 | 1 | Improved Crosswalks | 5 | B | D | Same as prior page | |
| 37 | 2 | Residential Pedestrian Environment | 5 | B | D | Desire to maintain/improve open/green space in commercial core | |
| 37 | 3 | Illustration | | | N/A | | illustration |
| 38 | 1 | Pedestrian Connection to Greenlake | 5 | B | D | connection for greenlake riders | reference in text doesn't match photo |
| 38 | 2 | Photo | 6 | | N/A | | photo |
| 39 | 1 | Diagram | | | N/A | | illustration needs more development, lacks consistency |
| 40 | 1 | Community Gathering Spaces Goals | 5 | A | D | open space planned; can the station area help provide this | re-write |
| 40 | 2 | Issues | 3 | B | D | Same as above | core and froula |
| 40 | 3 | Cowen Park | 5 | C | N | Cowen | redesign installation near complete |
| 40 | 4 | Froula Park | 4 | C | N | Froula | |
| 41 | 1 | Illustration | 6 | | N/A | | replace w/ public access spaces |
| 42 | 1 | Roosevelt Reservoir | 3 | B | N | Reservoir | cover and redesign |
| 42 | 2 | Open Spaces | 5 | D | D | SAP should help provide areas to bring this in | |

Roosevelt Neighborhood Plan Re-Visioning Team
 Existing Plan Assessment (with Station Area Planning Focus)

| Pg No | Seq | Description | Rate | Rank | SAP N/D/I | SAP Why/How | Comments |
|-------|-----|-------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--|---|
| 42 | 3 | Town Square | 5 | A | D | SAP should help provide areas to bring this in | target light rail |
| 42 | 4 | Neighborhood Community Center | 5 | D | D | SAP should help provide areas to bring this in | |
| 43 | 1 | Roosevelt High School Vision | 4 | A | N | | design complete |
| 43 | 2 | Issue | 6 | | N | | remove |
| 43 | 3 | Recommendations | 6 | | N | | remove |
| 43 | 4 | Recommendations | 6 | | N | | remove/ Add graffiti problems, integrate community/school |
| 43 | 5 | Recommendations | 6 | | N | | |
| 43 | 6 | Recommendations | 6 | | N | | remove |
| 44 | 1 | Design Guidelines Goals | 4 | A | D | SAP should consider our design guidelines and goals | reorganize,add to apendix? Integrate? |
| 44 | 2 | Issues | 3 | B | D | Same as above | |
| 44 | 3 | Recommendations | 3 | C | D | Same as above | |
| 44 | 4 | Lower Thresholds | 5 | B | D | Same as above | |
| 44 | 5 | Transition Zones | 5 | B | D | Same as above | |
| 44 | 6 | Illustration | | | N/A | | illustration |
| 45 | 1 | Façade Upgrades | 5 | C | I | Integrating the street front of the station with other buildings | doesn't match illustration |
| 45 | 2 | Illustration | 6 | | N/A | | |

Roosevelt Neighborhood Plan Re-Visioning Team
Existing Plan Assessment (with Station Area Planning Focus)

| Pg | No | Seq | Description | Rate | Rank | SAP N/D/I | SAP Why/How | Comments |
|-----------|-----------|------------|----------------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| 46 | 1 | | Transportation Goal | 4 | A | D | SAP should consider how to integrate all modes of transportation near the station | re-write |
| 46 | 2 | | Issues | 2 | B | D | Same as above | expand |
| 46 | 3 | | Recommendations | 5 | B | D | Same as above | re-write/revise |
| 46 | 4 | | Speed Limit Signs | 5 | B | D | Same as above | school zones. traffic signs |
| 47 | 1 | | Illustration | 6 | | N/A | | out of date |
| 48 | 1 | | Crosswalks and Curb Bulbs | 5 | B | D | SAP should consider how pedestrian will travel around the station | |
| 48 | 2 | | Pedestrian Crossing | 4 | B | D | traffic lights/timing (same as above) | |
| 48 | 3 | | Street Trees | 3 | A | D | SAP should plan to revitalize anything undone by construction work | |
| 49 | 1 | | Peak Hour Travel Lanes | 5 | C | D | Traffic impacts; peak hour lanes | updated info |
| 49 | 2 | | Conversion of One-Way to Two-way | 5 | D | D | traffic flow | |
| 50 | 1 | | Parking Goal | 4 | A | D | SAP is going to result in park and ride folks; where will they park? | re-write |
| 50 | 2 | | Issues | 5 | B | D | Same as above | changes have happened |
| 50 | 3 | | High School Parking | 6 | | D | HS overflow parking | |
| 50 | 4 | | On-street Parking | 5 | B | D | on street parking (above) | |

Roosevelt Neighborhood Plan Re-Visioning Team
Existing Plan Assessment (with Station Area Planning Focus)

| Pg | Seq | Description | Rate | Rank | SAP N/D/I | SAP Why/How | Comments |
|-----------|------------|---------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|--|-------------------|
| 51 | 1 | Light Rail Vision | 4 | A | D | This whole section is about light rail station | outdated |
| 51 | 2 | Issues | 5 | A | D | Same as above | " |
| 52 | 1 | Vehicular and Pedestrian Access | 5 | A | D | Same as above | " |
| 52 | 2 | Parking Impacts | 5 | A | D | Same as above w/ parking | " |
| 53 | 1 | Community Character / Streetscape | 5 | A | D | Same as above regarding Street Trees and things undone by construction streetscape | " |
| 53 | 2 | Land Use | 5 | A | D | Same as above w/ land use | |
| 53 | 3 | Illustration | | | N/A | | illustrations |
| 54 | 1 | Sound Transit Session (Sept 29, 1998) | 6 | | D | Decision is made no longer applicable | remove |
| 55 | 1 | Sound Transit Board Decision | 6 | | D | Decision is made no longer applicable | " |
| 56 | 1 | Community Safety Vision | 4 | A | D | How will "outsiders" impact the community safety/livability | |
| 56 | 2 | Issues | 5 | B | I | Same as above | other issues also |
| 56 | 3 | Promoting a Healthy Environment | 6 | | I | Same as above | remove |
| 56 | 4 | Community Policing | 5 | B | I | Same as above | |