SACRAMENTO VALLEY STATION: CREATING THE NORTH STATE TRANSPORTATION CENTER
Building on Local Network Success
PRESENTATION OUTLINE

- Overview of SVS Phasing
- Site History – Relevant to Phase 3 Approach
- Previous Review and Comment – Design Responses
- Grant Application – Regional Transit Center
Overview of SVS Phasing
June 1993

18 months of Capitol Corridor Service
June 2007

6 months after City Purchases station and 32 acres

Tracks at historic location behind station
June 2018

5 years after completion of Phase 1
Track Relocation and Bridges and roads in Railyards

1 year after City completed Phase 2 Renovation

6 months after start of current Phase 3 master plan work
SACRAMENTO VALLEY STATION – PHASE 1
Track Relocation and New Platforms
Sacramento Valley Station – Phase 2
Moving Amtrak in Response to Track Relocation and Anticipation of Phase 3

Program Change
- Flip building program for new site patterns

- Amtrak
- Retail
- Passengers
SACRAMENTO VALLEY STATION – PHASE 2
Moving Amtrak in Response to Track Relocation and Anticipation of Phase 3 - Restaurant Room to Amtrak Crew Base
SACRAMENTO VALLEY STATION – PHASE 2
Main Waiting Room Renovation – Restoring the main public space for decades in the future
Site History – Relevant to Phase 3 Approach
HISTORIC SETTING FOR PUBLIC EVENTS

IMPORTANCE OF PUBLIC SPACE at SVS: Public Events during Southern Pacific Ownership
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IMPORTANCE OF PUBLIC SPACE at SVS: Public Events during Southern Pacific Ownership
HISTORIC SETTING FOR PUBLIC EVENTS

IMPORTANCE OF PUBLIC SPACE at SVS: Public Events during Southern Pacific Ownership
HISTORIC RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STATION AND HISTORIC SHOPS

Site as active Railyard – Views between Historic Shops and Station were not as today.
HISTORIC CONNECTION TO MARSHES AT RIVER EDGE

Filling of Sutter Lake 1908 to 1912 which station was built on 13 years later
2017 CONCEPTS – Option 1 & 2
INITIAL CONCEPTS 2016 -2017

SVS Master Plan
Preservation Commission August 16, 2017
Commissioner Questions and Comments
Link to streaming video of presentation and questions:

Commissioner Questions:

Vice Chair: How are we repurposing the old building that we spent all the money on?

GT Response: Will be evolutionary process to understand where the city is at the time. Possible bicycle amenities and parking could be possible; however, the main transportation components do not make sense at the historic station. How do we best focus the integrity and importance of the historic building and meet the needs of the new transportation paradigm.

Vice Chair: Concern for the historic character of Chinatown, concern for strong connection to 4th Street and Chinatown. Want to make sure connection to Chinatown is not lost.

Vice Chair: Not clear what process is going forward.

GT: Will be moving towards a separate plan area outside Railyards Specific Plan and the Downtown Specific Plan. [Obviously, we have moved to amending the existing Specific Plan].

Commissioner Valiana: Is there any vehicular access to the south of the station? Is there still a drive in front of the station?

GT: Phasing out parking towards a pedestrian place. Trying to create a ped front. Citing Denver front plaza, no parking.

Commissioner Valiana: So, if I drove my car to the station to take a train, where would I park?

GT: Existing parking on Old Sac and future between 3rd & 4th north of tracks.

Commissioner Valiana: 1-5 hatched area, does the plan change depending on the ramps.

GT: Caltrans is looking at the entire viaduct, it is our window of opportunity to put an option out to redo the ramps.

Commissioner Fuller: I am confused by front park setting flanked by buildings; development in front of REA diminishes the impact of presentation of the REA and completely covers it. Also, the right lines that currently exist are going to be completely changed by new building. The view lines you show are not reality, you will not see the building as long as the corner building didn’t exist.

GT: True. However, we are anticipating the opportunity for two-way traffic and future corridors. Building was designed on Beaux-Arts principles of symmetry on 4th street axis; that symmetry and connection has been largely lost. We are trying to anticipate the reframing of the 4th Street view and framing the building. We have not studied the meaning and design of the building but are trying to bring this to light to receive comments on. Goal is also to anchor the corridor to help energy 5th Street with street-pedestrian experience.

Fuller: Wouldn’t an extended plaza enhance the pedestrian experience?

GT: The plaza we show is a block long.

Fuller: Yes, but your separating 5th street from the plaza with the building. How does that enhance the pedestrian experience?

GT: The interior lay-in to the space between SVS and REA that we can pull them into the site from 5th street.

Fuller: OK. So is there any option for allowance of drop-off on 1 Street?

GT: Looking forward we hope to create a more pedestrian-friendly 1 Street.

Fuller: Who owns the flanking buildings?

GT: REA privately owned.

Fuller: Previous schemes (SAMU), there seemed to be a stronger direct link to the historic building and the new concourse. Now with this new street, there is this very definite disconnect that sets the building alone and the concourse is a separate element. The interconnectivity is going to be greatly reduced without that connection between the two buildings.

GT: Honestly, I have been advocating for a more direct connection as well. However, when you look at the circulation needs, and we have done extensive studies on this, the site needs this through connection provided by H Street, and honestly, the prior schemes failed to recognize this need. This does create a separation.

Fuller: Can there be further study of the alignment of H Street?

GT: If the alignment of the vehicular traffic is dictated by the rail alignment, did anyone study just extending the concourse level above and over the street?

GT: Yes, but what happens is that you then have to either go up and then down, or land at a higher point to the north and are removed from the plaza. The height is at 20 ft, and what are you connecting to?

Fuller: Yes, but it could connect to that upper “mall experience” and pedestrian walkway. Activity on 5th Street is at +17, then everything could be at that level.

GT: Yes, we can still explore this. This scheme puts you more akin to Option 2. We are looking for the marriage of the two schemes coming out of this process, looking for the best of both.

Fuller: If the main level of the concourse is happening above the ground plane, I hope we would allow that to connect into the historic depot. Make that the primary connection into the historic depot?

Fuller: In the past, the prior schemes had the new concourse much more integrated into the historic building. It was tied to be more an extension of the historic station; never any schemes that showed it separate as a gem sitting on its own.

GT: Actually there was - some of the schemes had the building distinct on an open space and concourse wrapping the building. But yes, the new was much closer to the historic building. It has been looked at many different ways.

Fuller: It does seem that anytime you create that hub of activity (along H Street) with all this vehicular traffic, and the service vehicles, and the light rail and yet you say that there’s this nice blue line that goes right through this hub of activity, it’s like something has to give. You can’t have a hub of activity and a pedestrian crossing that is in the opposite direction; it’s going to be very difficult, its going to be isolate the historic building. So, I guess my questions to you would be, that you like me, would like to see the interconnectedness as well as the two buildings, so I guess I will get on the website and pose lots of very in-depth questions.

GT: [Response directing to the Main Waiting Room] you have a space that is distinct of itself, but it is not free and unfettered, with doors controlling the edges, so to see this space as the main entrance point with the volumes of people we see coming into the station in the years out, is not feasible. We need to think of multiple points of entry to the new concourse. That is why we realize the Main Waiting Room as it is now, is not going to be the main passage to the tracks and it will require multiple entries through the site for the sheer volume of people we foresee with the State rail plan.
Both the alternatives propose a new civic plaza that serve all users, a place that celebrates the rail heritage and introduces a new life to the site. The block comprised between H, I, 1st and 5th Streets will host a wide range of activities such as: office, retail, culture (e.g. art), food and beverage, and tourism. In the re-purposing of the historic station, these activities will be crucial to the success of the plan by creating a renewed historic landmark capable of projecting a new identity for the overall site.

Concerns: Constricted view to historic station from 5th & I Street
Concerns: Separation distance between new and historic building – road physical barrier
Limited access to front of station for vehicles and strong connection to Chinatown
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

Graphic Courtesy Downtown Railyards Ventures (edited)
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT
Current Development projects in planning or construction
OPPORTUNITY TO CONNECT STATION FOR BUSES AT 3RD STREET

Current Working Site Plan

Planned 3rd St. Extension for Streetcar – project fate unknown
Proposed reconfiguration of ramps to give buses direct access to freeway & improve pedestrian access. Concept designed to accommodate rail vehicles as currently planned.
PROPOSED TRANSIT NETWORK

Legend
- Light Rail
- Potential Street Car
- Regional Bus
- Local Bus Stop
- Local Bus Layover

PROPOSED LIGHT RAIL STATION CONCOURSE
18-BAY REGIONAL BUS FACILITY & PARKING GARAGE
HISTORIC STATION REBUILDING
RAILYARD DISTRICT
OLD SACRAMENTO
DOWNTOWN
PROPOSED BIKE NETWORK
BUS MOBILITY CENTER

+16' LEVEL
- Canopy soffit edge
- Biophilic funnels
- Canopy columns
- Stairs & elevators
- Back of house
- Connection to existing Tunnel level
- Future escalator provision for Concourse level
- Main structure
- Roof slats
- Photovoltaic panels

+7.5' LEVEL
- Bus Plaza level
- Bike Hub
- Restrooms

-5' LEVEL
- Parking level
BUS PLAZA LEVEL
NEW STATION PEDESTRIAN CONNECTIVITY

TRANSPORT PLAZA

CENTRAL SHOPS DISTRICT

LOT 40

LRT PLATFORM

TO G STREET
SUSTAINABILITY

LIVING COMMUNITY CHALLENGE
Sacramento Valley Station Master Plan is registered for the Living Community Challenge (LCC). LCC is a certification program that guides the design and construction of buildings and neighborhoods to be socially just, culturally rich, and ecologically restorative. LCC projects aim to have a net positive impact in seven petals: place, water, energy, health & happiness, materials, equity, and beauty.

LIVING BUILDING CHALLENGE
The new station building is registered for the Living Building Challenge (LBC). LBC is a certification program that guides the design and construction of buildings to be socially just, culturally rich, and ecologically restorative. LBC projects aim to have a net positive impact in seven petals: place, water, energy, health & happiness, materials, equity, and beauty.
SUSTAINABILITY - WATER

Net Positive Water -

- All rainwater and stormwater captured onsite
- All wastewater treated and recycled onsite
- All nonpotable water supplied onsite

Demonstrative innovative wastewater treatment technology
SUSTAINABILITY - ENERGY

Net Positive Energy -
• 105% of energy need supplied by renewable energy
• All electric (no gas) connections to reduce greenhouse gas emissions
• On-site energy storage to support a week of off-grid operations of critical facilities for resiliency
SUSTAINABILITY - BIOPHILIA

Biophilic Design -

- Embedding Nature at the station
- Design to enhance the sensory experience of sun, shade, delta breeze, sound and light
- Celebrating natural and cultural histories for a strong sense of place
RECONNECTING THE HISTORIC FABRIC
ESTABLISHING AN AXIAL RELATIONSHIP
CONTRASTING THE BUILDING SCALE
HISTORIC STATION CONTEXT
Best daylight performance - small floorplate and tall buildings

Compact shape is also good for energy performance

Better performance at higher floors – architecture teams can consider tuning glazing for higher window-to-wall ratio (WWR) at lower floors, lower WWR at higher floors

Spatial Daylight Autonomy, 300 lux for 50%+ of occupied hours
TOWER SEPARATION OPTIONS

OPTION 1

OPTION 2
HISTORIC STATION EXTENSION

Space Asia Hub by WOHA, Singapore

“Vieux Port” pavilion, Marseille, France

University of Kansas Architecture School Extension by Studio 804, KS

Utrecht Centraal, Utrecht, Netherlands
CIVIC PLAZA FOREGROUND-BEFORE

County Courthouse

Federal Courthouse

+60 ft
CIVIC PLAZA - AFTER

Residential

Hotel

Office

County Courthouse

Federal Courthouse

+ 350 ft

+ 240 ft

+ 60 ft

+ 350 ft

+ 350 ft
CIVIC PLAZA PROGRAM
SHOWCASING THE CITY’S CULTURE AND IDENTITY

RECREATION

COMMUNITY EVENTS

FARMERS MARKET

COMMUNITY GARDEN

RETAIL SPILLOUT
CIVIC PLAZA
TRANSIT PLAZA PROGRAM

CONCERTS

PUBLIC GATHERING

COMMUNITY AMENITIES

FOOD AND BEVERAGE

FOOD TRUCK
RIVER PARK PROGRAM

- Playground
- Dog Park
- Rock Climbing
- Skate Park
- Bird Habitat
SACRAMENTO VALLEY STATION

HISTORIC STATION

NEW STATION

BUS MOBILITY CENTER

NEW LRT STATION

REGENERATIVE GARDEN

SKATE PARK

ROCK CLIMBING AREA

DOG PARK

PLAYGROUND

RAINGARDEN

TRANSIT PLAZA

CIVIC PLAZA

CHINESE COMMEMORATIVE GARDEN

PLAYGROUND

DOG PARK

ROCK CLIMBING AREA

SKATE PARK

RAINGARDEN

TRANSIT PLAZA

CIVIC PLAZA

CHINESE COMMEMORATIVE GARDEN
PROCESS

OUTREACH

- Roundtable Discussions (Transit Agencies and Developers)
- Stakeholder Meeting #1
- Community Workshop #1
- Stakeholder Meeting #2
- Community Workshop #2
- Community Workshop #3

EARLY IMPLEMENTATION

- Project and 30% Schematic Design
- Specific Plan and Design Guidelines
- Council and Commission Hearing and Adoption

2019
- Feb
- Mar
- Apr
- May
- Jun
- Jul
- Aug
- Sep
- Oct
- Nov
- Dec

2020
- Jan
- Feb
- Mar
- Apr
- May
- Jun
- Jul