

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE: Council Goal #1 – Update on Aurora Corridor Environmental Process
DEPARTMENT: Public Works and Planning and Development Services
PRESENTED BY: Paul Haines, Public Works Director
Tim Stewart, Planning and Development Services Director
Kirk McKinley, Aurora Corridor Project Manager

PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT:

The purpose of this agenda item is to brief the Mayor and City Council on the 145th – 165th Environmental Assessment and Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EA/DEIS) for Aurora Avenue North. The EA/DEIS was released for public comment on July 10, 2002, an open house and public hearing was held on August 6, 2002, and the public comment period closed at 5:00 PM on August 16, 2002. The City Council will be reviewing the testimony and identifying a preferred alternative.

ALTERNATIVES ANALYZED:

The EA/DEIS analyzes three alternatives:

- 1) No Build Alternative
- 2) Alternative A: similar to the concept in the Pre-Design Study (August 23, 1999, Resolution #156), and includes landscaped median with focussed left and u-turn pockets, Business Access Transit Lanes (BAT lanes), and a four foot wide amenity zone, and eight foot wide sidewalks.
- 3) Alternative B: includes a center median with more opportunities for left and u-turns, and 7 foot wide sidewalks.

The cross section for Alternative A is 112 feet, while Alternative B is 102 feet. Chapter 3 of the EA/DEIS includes analysis of existing conditions in sections called "Affected Environment"; impacts during construction; and impacts resulting directly from the project in sections called "Operational Impacts". The following disciplines are investigated: Transportation, Land Use, Social, Economics, Air Quality, Noise, Water Quality/Surface Water, Wildlife/Fisheries/Vegetation, Historic and Archaeological Resources, Visual Quality, and Hazardous Materials. Attached is a summary matrix that was made available to the public during the August 6 open house and public hearing. It is a summary analysis of the differences of each alternative by discipline or analysis area.

Chapter 3 also includes a discussion/analysis under each discipline entitled "Secondary and Cumulative Impacts". Secondary Impacts are potential indirect affects of the

project alternatives. Cumulative Impacts are the combined affects of the project alternatives with all future possible projects over the next 20 years (e.g. potential projects listed in the Capital Improvement Program). These discussions have caused some confusion, as the analysis assumes completion of the entire Aurora Corridor project, and Interurban Trail. Since the environmental analysis, selection of a preferred alternative, and design has not yet occurred for the Aurora projects north of 165th, the analysis assumed a centered Aurora with an assumed right of way width of 110 feet. In addition, the EIS analysis did not include the potential mitigation that would be applied through implementation of the "32 Points" that were included in Council Resolution #156.

SUMMARY OF HEARING COMMENTS:

The August 6 public open house and hearing was well-attended with over 100 people participating. The City provided a court reporter at the open house so those who preferred could offer testimony without the stress of an audience (four citizens utilized this option). The City also provided a Korean language interpreter, and sign language specialists. The intent of the open house, which was held between 5:30 and 7:00 PM immediately preceding the hearing, was to provide an opportunity for the public to better understand the EA/DEIS document and to provide them the opportunity to prepare their testimony. All speakers were allowed three minutes to speak, and those representing groups were allowed five minutes. In addition to the oral testimony, comment cards were available to turn in at the meeting or mail back. Testimony was provided by 42 people and 10 comment cards were submitted. The Planning Commission hosted the hearing, with Brian Doennebrink chairing. Testimony was varied, well articulated, and valuable. A verbatim transcript has been prepared which, as with all of the written comments, will become a part of the official record and will be published in or as an appendix to the FEIS. Staff will present a summary of the types of comments at the August 19 meeting.

NEXT STEPS:

Staff will be scheduling time on the Council agendas for the next several months to review comments, the EA/DEIS, and the Value Engineering Study to form a preferred alternative. The preferred alternative will be developed in conjunction with the FEIS, and must also be coordinated with the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). Because state and federal environmental processes have been combined into one document, the process to develop a FEIS (for SEPA) will precede the federal process required by NEPA. The basic steps are as follows:


- Comment period for Aurora Avenue 145-165 Project ends August 16, 2002, 5 p.m.
- City of Shoreline and the FHWA improve the design alternatives based on analysis and public comment to date including Value Engineering Study recommendations
- City of Shoreline issues SEPA Final EIS with responses to public and agency comments (anticipated late October 2002)
- Shoreline City Council votes on preferred alternative for the Aurora Avenue 145-165 Project (anticipated early November 2002) As part of the preferred alternative

selection process, the City Council will review and decide on various cost reduction options and elements.

- Under NEPA, the FHWA reviews impacts of proposed action and, if no significant impacts identified, issues a Finding of No Significant Impact (anticipated November 2002)
- After both environmental documents issued, City continues with final design and construction

Staff will describe these steps in greater detail during the August 19 workshop.

The fall will be an extremely busy time working on developing and analyzing the preferred alternative. One of the major benefits of the environmental process and public input is the ability to develop an alternative that can balance some of the needs/concerns/issues into a concept that addresses many of the identified concerns and still meets the goals of the project.

Approved By: City Manager  City Attorney ____

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Summary of Operational Impacts – Aurora Avenue 145-165 Project Alternatives

This page intentionally left blank.

Attachment A

Summary of Operational Impacts – Aurora Avenue 145-165 Project Alternatives

Element	No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B
Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The average vehicle delay for project intersections would be 87.3 with 2 signalized intersections operating at LOS F Traffic volumes along neighborhood streets parallel to Aurora Ave would increase Crash rates would be equal or greater than existing conditions Transit speed and service reliability would deteriorate Pedestrian travel would be unsafe and uncomfortable Uncontrolled and increased volumes would effectively block access across the roadway for trucks and emergency vehicles during peak traffic times 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The average vehicle delay for project intersections would improve to 55 seconds with 1 intersection operating at LOS F Alternative A would help reduce the amount of traffic that would divert into neighborhoods Access management treatments can reduce accident rates 26% and property damage rates 40% Transit speed and service reliability would be improved Pedestrian safety would be improved; access is enhanced and comfortable Access to properties will be maintained by locating the median openings at major truck access points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The average vehicle delay for project intersections would improve the same amount as in Alternative A Alternative B would help reduce the amount of traffic that would divert into neighborhoods Access management treatments can reduce accident the same amount as in Alternative A Transit speed and service reliability would be improved similar to Alternative A Pedestrian safety would be improved similar to Alternative A; access is enhanced but pedestrian comfort is lower than Alternative A Access to properties will be maintained by locating the median openings at major truck access points
Historic and Cultural Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There would be no impacts to historical properties or archaeological resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two properties with reasonable historic associations exist: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pershing Interurban Bulkhead Hide-a-Way Tavern Impacts would be limited to right-of-way encroachment (roadway improvements will be closer to the structures than in existing conditions) Structures lack architectural integrity and merit necessary for state or national historic listing Archaeological sites are unlikely to exist in the project area SHPO has concurred with these 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts would be limited to right-of-way encroachment (roadway improvements will be closer to the structures than in existing conditions) Impacts would be slightly less than Alternative A due to narrower road right-of-way

Summary of Operational Impacts – Aurora Avenue 145-165 Project Alternatives

Element	No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B
Water Quality/Surface Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No stormwater detention, treatment or special oil-control facilities associated with the roadway would be constructed The pollutant loads in the stormwater runoff from the roadway would continue to be discharged to local streams 	<p>findings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impervious surfaces would change as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> +9,800 sf in Boeing Creek Basin +1,100 sf in Thornton Creek Basin -2,600 sf in W. Lake Washington Basin Detention facilities would accommodate runoff from all newly created impervious surfaces Water Quality facilities would treat stormwater runoff from all new and replaced impervious surfaces Water quality would improve in the receiving streams and runoff rates would remain stable Special oil control facilities would be constructed at the two high-use intersections (145th and 155th Streets) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impervious surfaces would change as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> +29,500 sf in Boeing Creek Basin +800 sf in Thornton Creek Basin -2,600 sf in W. Lake Washington Basin Detention and treatment facilities would be constructed to similar standards as in Alternative A A small but unavoidable increase in stormwater runoff to the Boeing Creek basin is expected due to the increase in impervious surfaces. Special oil control facilities would be constructed at the two high-use intersections (145th and 155th Streets)
Air Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic delays would increase, causing an increase in vehicle emissions from idling and slow-moving traffic This alternative would not worsen any existing carbon monoxide violations CO concentrations at North 160th Street would be slightly higher than the other alternatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This alternative would not create new carbon monoxide violations of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards This alternative would not worsen any existing carbon monoxide violations CO concentrations at North 155th Street would be higher than the No Action Alternative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This alternative would not create new carbon monoxide violations of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards This alternative would not worsen any existing carbon monoxide violations CO concentrations at North 155th Street would be higher than the No Action Alternative
Visual Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The visual environment would not change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would improve the visual intactness and unity of the project area Pedestrians and transit riders would likely have the most positive response to visual improvements Positive impact on visual quality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would improve the intactness and unity of the project area to a lesser degree Would have a less positive impact on visual quality than Alternative A
Land Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No land would be acquired 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative A would require 0.79 acres 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative B would require 0.47 acres

Summary of Operational Impacts – Aurora Avenue 145-165 Project Alternatives

Element	No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There would be no additional incentives for land use patterns to change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> of new right-of-way No buildings would be demolished; proposed sidewalks and landscaping would be directly adjacent or in close proximity to several existing buildings Could produce both positive and negative effects on property values 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> of new right-of-way Other land use impacts would be similar to Alternative A
Wildlife, Fisheries, and Vegetation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current impacts to fisheries would continue, with water quality and water volume discharge impacts remaining the predominant concern 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative A will have no net effect on wildlife and fisheries Best management practices and water quality and quantity facilities should protect fish from sediment and contaminants in road runoff Vegetation that would be removed provides little habitat 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative B would have a increase in impervious surfaces than Alternative A, but there would still be no net effect on wildlife and fisheries due to the implementation of water quality and quantity facilities. Same vegetation impacts as Alternative A
Social	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No impacts to recreation facilities Regional and community growth patterns would continue to fluctuate Increased congestion could hinder the provision of public services and increase the need for emergency services due to increased crash rates Unsafe conditions for pedestrians and bicyclists would continue No disproportionate and adverse effects due to the alternatives are expected to impact minority or low-income populations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The capacity and use of Darnell Park would not change under either alternative, but access to it would be slightly improved Would have no direct effect on population growth or demographic growth patterns Minor utility disruptions could occur during construction Emergency vehicle service would be mostly unaffected Substantial improvement for pedestrian safety; no formal bicycle lanes No disproportionate and adverse effects due to the alternatives are expected to impact minority or low-income populations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same recreation impacts as Alt. A Same regional and community growth impacts as Alternative A Minor utility disruptions could occur during construction; additional right-of-way might be necessary to accommodate the full width of underground utility vaults. Emergency vehicle service would be mostly unaffected; additional median breaks would result in slightly less impact to service times Improved pedestrian safety; no formal bicycle lanes No disproportionate and adverse effects due to the alternatives are expected to impact minority or low-income populations
Economics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No decrease in property tax revenues Increased congestion would 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access to businesses may be less desirable due to the removal of the 2-way left-turn lane; this would be partially offset by the inclusion of left- 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access to businesses may be less desirable without 2-way left-turn lane; more turning opportunities than in Alternative A would be built

Summary of Operational Impacts – Aurora Avenue 145-165 Project Alternatives

Element	No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> delay the movement of persons, goods, and services Businesses and customers may move to areas with better mobility, less congestion, fewer traffic crashes and more attractive appearance Might reduce the potential for new development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> and U-turn opportunities Alternative A would impact 11 compliant parking stalls after mitigation \$1,086 in property tax losses per year to the City Businesses might experience a modest sales increase due to increased mobility; a small corresponding sales tax gain could be expected by the City Might make properties more attractive for businesses and new development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative B would impact 6 compliant parking stalls after mitigation \$574 in property tax losses per year to the City Businesses might experience a modest sales increase due to increased mobility; a small corresponding sales tax gain could be expected by the City Might make properties more attractive for businesses and new development.
Hazardous Waste	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There would be no impacts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential construction impacts include releases of contaminants to the environment by ground-disturbing or dewatering activities There is the potential for release to the environment of hazardous substances used or transported during routine operation and maintenance of roadways 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same potential impacts as Alternative A.
Noise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exterior noise levels in 2020 would increase over existing conditions at two receivers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exterior noise levels in 2020 are the same as the No Action Alternative Interior noise levels in 2020 are well within FHWA standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exterior noise levels in 2020 are the same as Alternative A and the No Action Alternative Interior noise levels in 2020 are the same as Alternative A