

RESOLUTION _____

1
2 A RESOLUTION stating the City’s recommendations related to the SR 520 Bridge Replacement and
3 High Occupancy Vehicle Project and commenting on the outcomes of the mediation process
under ESSB 6099.

4 WHEREAS, the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), Sound Transit (ST) and the
5 Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) continue to advance the SR 520 Bridge Replacement
and High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Project; and

6 WHEREAS, SR 520 is a vital transportation corridor for the region, the City of Seattle and its residents;
7 and

8 WHEREAS, in 2007, the Washington State Legislature adopted Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill (ESSB)
9 6099 creating a facilitated stakeholder mediation process to identify impacts and mitigation
measures related to the west side of the project corridor; and

10 WHEREAS, the Executive and a member of the City Council have participated in the stakeholder
11 mediation process along with dozens of representatives from Seattle neighborhoods, Eastside
12 communities, the Arboretum Foundation, the University of Washington, resource agencies and
advocates of other impacted interests; and

13 WHEREAS, the goal of the mediation process was to develop and submit a Project Impact Plan (PIP) to
the Governor and State Legislature by the end of 2008; and

14 WHEREAS, ESSB 6099 states that “before the mediator may submit the project impact plan, it must be
15 reviewed by the mayor of Seattle and the Seattle city council. The project impact plan must
16 reflect whether the mayor and council concur or do not concur”: and

17 WHEREAS, the City Council previously adopted Resolution 30777, which stated guiding principles for
18 the project, and Resolution 30974, which outlined design criteria and mitigation measures to be
incorporated into the preferred alternative for the corridor; and

19 WHEREAS, with the emergence of new alternatives as part of the ESSB 6099 stakeholder mediation
20 process and other project developments since the Council’s last formal action related to SR 520, it
is appropriate for the City to make additional project recommendations at this time; and

21 WHEREAS, the Governor and State Legislature will be reviewing the PIP in the first quarter of 2009 and
22 are expected to make decisions on several aspects of the project before the end of the 2009
legislative session; and

23 WHEREAS, the PIP recommends that three new corridor alternatives (titled as Options A, K and L) be
24 evaluated as part of WSDOT’s Supplemental Draft Environment Impact Statement (SDEIS); and

25 WHEREAS, at present the environmental and transportation analysis related to each new alternative is
26 incomplete and the potential tradeoffs have not been fully evaluated or analyzed; and

1 WHEREAS, the current financing plan for the SR 520 Project is insufficient to fund any of the
alternatives as proposed; and

2 WHEREAS, with the emergence of new design elements for some of the mediation alternatives as
3 recently as December of 2008, it would be premature to designate a preferred alternative without
further analysis and consideration; and

4 WHEREAS, the City Council has listened to the priorities and concerns of the most directly impacted
5 stakeholders of the SR 520 Project as well as the broader Seattle community and desires to
continue communicating its recommendations to the Governor, State Legislature and WSDOT;
6 NOW, THEREFORE,

7 **BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SEATTLE THAT:**

8
9 Section 1. The City Council, having reviewed the SR 520 mediation group PIP, hereby concurs
10 with the recommendation that Options A, K and L be studied as part of a WSDOT SDEIS. The City
11 Council also urges the Governor and the State Legislature to not declare a preferred alternative for the
12 west side alignment and interchange design until sufficient analysis has been completed through the
13 SDEIS process.

14
15 Section 2. The City Council reaffirms the recommendations for design criteria made with regard
16 to the SR 520 Project in Resolution 30974. The Governor and State Legislature are requested to
17 designate a preferred alternative for the west side alignment and interchange design that best meets the
18 criteria as outlined in Resolution 30974. The criteria are summarized as follows:
19

- 20 A. Design for transit connectivity and reliability;
- 21 B. Reduce congestion at the Montlake Bridge and improve north-south mobility between
22 Seattle neighborhoods;
- 23 C. Narrow the corridor by reducing lane and shoulder widths;
- 24 D. Reduce noise and visual impacts;
- 25 E. Protect open space, the environment and the Washington Park Arboretum;
- 26 F. Promote bike and pedestrian access;
- 27

- 1 G. Incorporate Project Design Advisory Group and Seattle Design Commission
- 2 recommendations for design excellence and aesthetic quality;
- 3 H. Mitigate and address the concerns of the University of Washington; and
- 4 I. Protect access for freight.

5
6 Section 3. In addition to the criteria in Resolution 30974, the City Council hereby recommends
7 the following additional design and mitigation criteria related to the SR 520 Project:

- 8 A. WSDOT should fully implement the recommendations from the Health Impact
- 9 Assessment that was completed for the SR 520 Project by Seattle-King County Public
- 10 Health;
- 11 B. The Governor and State Legislature should identify full funding for transit operations as
- 12 outlined and proposed in the High Capacity Transit Plan for the corridor;
- 13 C. Given new cost estimates, additional funding for the SR 520 Project should be identified
- 14 in 2009. A new financing plan that recognizes and includes funding for transit operations
- 15 as a core element of the project should also be developed;
- 16 D. WSDOT should phase construction of the project to allow for more time to analyze the
- 17 options and neighborhood impacts;
- 18 E. The Governor and State Legislature should take a holistic view of the transportation
- 19 impacts of each proposed alternative and not focus primarily on the traffic analysis of the
- 20 SR 520 mainline. The traffic impacts of each alternative on local arterials and
- 21 neighborhoods are an integral part of the entire corridor and the region's transportation
- 22 system. Considering traffic flow on the mainline without understanding how travelers
- 23 actually get to and from actual destinations is not a meaningful analysis;
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

1 F. In Option K, the “keyhole” design for Lake Washington Boulevard to the Arboretum
2 does not function in a manner consistent with the goals of minimizing impacts on the
3 Arboretum. This aspect of Option K should be redesigned;

4 G. In Option A, the emergence of a proposal to widen 24th Avenue south of the Montlake
5 Bridge is not consistent with the goals of minimizing neighborhood impacts and avoiding
6 the removal of private property for the project. More analysis is necessary, but at
7 present, this proposal appears unacceptable;

8 H. In 2009, the Governor and State Legislature should authorize the implementation of a
9 tolling plan for the SR 520 Project that maximizes the throughput of people (not
10 vehicles). The plan should include the use of variable tolling rates as a form of active
11 traffic demand management and raise sufficient revenue to support the replacement of SR
12 520 and ongoing maintenance and operations along the corridor (including transit
13 operations). Early tolling should be implemented on both I-90 and SR 520 in 2010;

14 I. WSDOT should continue to engage and regularly update the public, the mediation
15 participants and the City of Seattle in 2009 with new project information and progress on
16 the SDEIS. WSDOT should also include the City of Seattle in project decision-making;
17 and
18

19 J. No preferred alternative for the west-side alignment should include more than six (6)
20 lanes of traffic on the Portage Bay Viaduct from Montlake to I-5.
21

22
23 Section 4: The City Council also hereby makes the following recommendations related to the
24 SDEIS and future analysis for the SR 520 Project:

25 A. WSDOT’s ongoing transportation analysis should be expanded to include not only AM
26 and PM peak travel time considerations but also off-peak operations and full
27
28

1 consideration of the impacts of any replacement option that includes a second bascule
2 bridge. In addition, WSDOT should include in its analysis a model of the no-build
3 scenario in 2030 with tolling in place in order to provide a fair baseline comparison for
4 all replacement scenarios;

5 B. The SDEIS should provide detail on potential construction impacts and how they will
6 differ among Options A, K, and L. Information about how construction impacts could be
7 minimized should also be provided;

8 C. The results of recent traffic analyses completed for Children's Hospital and University
9 Village should be reviewed by WSDOT and incorporated into the SDEIS as appropriate;

10 D. The SDEIS should analyze and compare the carbon emissions that would be generated by
11 Options A, K, and L;

12 E. The SDEIS should account for the fact that Sound Transit light rail will eventually extend
13 north to Northgate and Lynnwood, which will increase the number of transit passengers
14 that utilize the University of Washington station. With the arrival of light rail, the
15 ridership on bus routes that serve the station area is also likely to rise and these impacts
16 should be considered and evaluated; and

17 F. The SDEIS should evaluate how Options A, K, and L would impact overall transit
18 operations in the vicinity of SR 520. In order to ensure transit will continue to function
19 both on and off the SR 520 mainline after the new bridge is constructed, particular
20 attention must also be paid to transit operations, including intracity transit operations that
21 use the Montlake Bridge corridor to connect communities north and south of the
22 Montlake Cut.
23

24 G. All alternatives evaluated should include the maximum amount of transportation demand
25 management (TDM) along the SR 520 corridor.
26
27
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Adopted by the City Council the ____ day of _____, 2009, and signed by
me in open session in authentication of its adoption this _____ day
of _____, 2009.

President _____ of the City Council

Filed by me this ____ day of _____, 2009.

City Clerk

(Seal)