

## SUMMARY and FISCAL NOTE\*

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Dept. Contact/Phone:</b>	<b>CBO Contact/Phone:</b>
Transportation	Ganth Lingam / 4-7573	Aaron Blumenthal/ 3-2656

*\* Note that the Summary and Fiscal Note describes the version of the bill or resolution as introduced; final legislation including amendments may not be fully described.*

### **1. BILL SUMMARY**

#### **Legislation Title:**

AN ORDINANCE relating to the State Route 520 Bridge Replacement and High Occupancy Vehicle Program; authorizing execution of an amendment to General Maintenance Agreement GMB 1094 between The City of Seattle and the State of Washington, to add the Portage Bay Bridge and Roanoke Lid Project.

#### **Summary and Background of the Legislation:**

This legislation would authorize the City to execute Amendment No. 1 to General Maintenance Agreement GMB 1094 with the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) regarding future Operation and Maintenance responsibilities related to the State Route (SR) 520: Portage Bay Bridge and Roanoke Lid Project.

In 2010, the Governor announced the State's Preferred Alternative for the SR 520, Interstate 5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and High Occupancy Vehicle Project (Program), which included a six-lane corridor with a new floating bridge, a new West Approach, a new Portage Bay Bridge, a second Bascule Bridge over the Montlake Cut, a new lid at Montlake, a new lid at 10th and Delmar, and an enhanced bicycle/pedestrian path crossing over Interstate 5. The State Legislature then established a \$4.65 billion budget for the Program.

WSDOT and the City entered into a Project Vision and Coordination Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), authorized by [Ordinance 123733](#) in October 2011, to identify roles and responsibilities for the Program and memorialize the City's continued involvement with the Program through its duration and WSDOT's coordination with stakeholders and the community through the Seattle Community Design Process (SCDP) for community amenity and lid design features.

Pursuant to the MOU, WSDOT hosted the SCDP and issued a Final Report in 2012. Through the adoption of [Resolution 31427](#) in February 2013, the City endorsed the general vision expressed in the Final Report and requested development and evaluation of options with respect to the Final Report recommendations for certain design elements, including the Roanoke Area, Portage Bay Bridge, Montlake Area, and multimodal connections.

WSDOT continued working with the community and the City to build on the SCDP results and in consultation with the Seattle Design Commission, explored design solutions for areas that had been identified through the SCDP as needing further refinement. The design refinement effort culminated in a 2014 Final Concept Design Report. The City adopted

[Resolution 31611](#) in October 2015, concurring with the recommendations included in the Final Concept Design Report.

The 2011 MOU recognized WSDOT’s intent to work with the City to establish an Operation and Maintenance agreement for the SR 520 improvements. The City passed [Ordinance 125754](#) in January 2019, authorizing execution of General Maintenance Agreement GMB 1094 with WSDOT to document Operation and Maintenance responsibilities related to the SR 520: Montlake to Lake Washington – Interchange and Bridge Replacement Project. Upon City’s acceptance of the project improvements, the Operation and Maintenance responsibilities would take effect in accordance with GMB 1094.

Both WSDOT and the City acknowledged that final design had not yet been developed and that due to WSDOT’s use of the design-build contract method to deliver their project, any significant changes to the conceptual design completed at the time of agreement execution may require modification of the Operation and Maintenance responsibilities through an amendment to GMB 1094. Future phases of the SR 520 Program would also be addressed by an amendment.

WSDOT is currently planning design, construction, and operation of the Portage Bay Bridge (PBB) and Roanoke Lid Project, another phase of the SR 520 Program. The PBB Project went through a public engagement process in 2019 to solicit community feedback on conceptual designs and received endorsement from the Seattle Design Commission in 2020. WSDOT and the City now wish to amend GMB 1094 for the addition of Operation and Maintenance responsibilities related to the PBB Project.

## 2. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Does this legislation create, fund, or amend a CIP Project?       Yes  No

## 3. SUMMARY OF FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Does this legislation amend the Adopted Budget?       Yes  No

**Does the legislation have other financial impacts to The City of Seattle that are not reflected in the above, including direct or indirect, short-term or long-term costs?**

Yes. There are financial impacts to City departments (SDOT, Parks, SPU, and SCL) related to annual Operation and Maintenance (O&M) costs as a result of Amendment No. 1 to General Maintenance Agreement GMB 1094.

For SDOT, the annual O&M cost to support new City-owned and maintained infrastructure built by the Portage Bay Bridge and Roanoke Lid phase of the SR-520 Program is estimated at \$56,000. The SR-520 Program will also replace existing City infrastructure, such as new street and sidewalk pavement, which will reduce the need for O&M in the near term by improving asset condition. A 50-year lifecycle is expected for concrete pavement, sidewalks, and curb ramps; a 30-year lifecycle is expected for asphalt surfaces; and a 75-year lifecycle is

expected for structural walls. SDOT will be requesting additional capital budget in the long term for replacement of the infrastructure as appropriate.

Parks will be reimbursed by WSDOT at \$10,500 per acre per year for basic landscaping maintenance in State limited access right-of-way. The original Agreement provides for escalation through an annual adjustment equal to the percentage change in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers for the Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue area. The level of care will be commensurate with the available funding. However, Parks will be responsible for the O&M costs of structural walls that support their facilities, for which they may request additional budget.

For SPU, the annual O&M cost is estimated at less than \$100,000. SPU may request additional budget to the SPU Drainage and Wastewater fund.

For SCL, a 10-year lifecycle is expected for standard illumination fixtures, and a 30-year lifecycle for illumination poles and foundations. SCL is not anticipated to request additional budget.

Note: All figures are in 2022 dollars. The departments may request additional budget to be adopted as early as 2030.

**Are there financial costs or other impacts of *not* implementing the legislation?**

If the legislation is not implemented, the City and the State will not have clarity about their respective responsibilities for the infrastructure that will be constructed and will have to rely on existing guidelines, RCW, GM 381 and GM 359 for existing infrastructure.

**4. OTHER IMPLICATIONS**

- a. Does this legislation affect any departments besides the originating department?**  
Yes. There are financial impacts to Parks, SPU, and SCL as described above.
- b. Is a public hearing required for this legislation?**  
No.
- c. Is publication of notice with *The Daily Journal of Commerce* and/or *The Seattle Times* required for this legislation?**  
No.
- d. Does this legislation affect a piece of property?**  
No.
- e. Please describe any perceived implication for the principles of the Race and Social Justice Initiative. Does this legislation impact vulnerable or historically disadvantaged communities? What is the Language Access plan for any communications to the public?**  
There are no known impacts to vulnerable or historically disadvantaged communities.

**f. Climate Change Implications**

**1. Emissions: Is this legislation likely to increase or decrease carbon emissions in a material way?**

No.

**2. Resiliency: Will the action(s) proposed by this legislation increase or decrease Seattle's resiliency (or ability to adapt) to climate change in a material way? If so, explain. If it is likely to decrease resiliency in a material way, describe what will or could be done to mitigate the effects.**

No.

**g. If this legislation includes a new initiative or a major programmatic expansion: What are the specific long-term and measurable goal(s) of the program? How will this legislation help achieve the program's desired goal(s)?**

This legislation does not include any new initiative or major programmatic expansion.

**Summary Attachments:**