



Signature Report

July 2, 2007

Motion 12538

Proposed No. 2007-0361.1

Sponsors Constantine

1 A MOTION approving the Vashon Highway Preservation
2 Alternatives Analysis Revised Work Plan.

3
4 WHEREAS, the King County council in approving the 2007 Budget Ordinance,
5 Ordinance 15652, included two provisos that limit expenditure or encumbrance of funds
6 for the Vashon Highway Preservation project (CIP 300310), until the council approves by
7 motion a revised work plan transmitted by the executive for an alternatives analysis of the
8 project, and

9 WHEREAS, the provisos are contained in Ordinance 15652, section 58, P3, and
10 section 120, P3, and

11 WHEREAS, the executive has transmitted a revised work plan in response to a
12 revised interpretation of the provisos, and

13 WHEREAS, the revised work plan includes a scope of work, tasks, list of
14 evaluative criteria to be used, schedule, milestones and budget for the work, in
15 satisfaction of the requirements specified in the provisos;

16 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT MOVED by the Council of King County:


Motion 12538

17 The revised work plan entitled "Vashon Highway Preservation Alternatives
18 Analysis Work Plan" is hereby approved.
19

Motion 12538 was introduced on 6/18/2007 and passed by the Metropolitan King County Council on 7/2/2007, by the following vote:


Yes: 9 - Mr. Gossett, Ms. Patterson, Ms. Lambert, Mr. von Reichbauer, Mr. Dunn, Mr. Ferguson, Mr. Phillips, Ms. Hague and Mr. Constantine
No: 0
Excused: 0

KING COUNTY COUNCIL
KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON



Larry Gossett, Chair

ATTEST:



Anne Noris, Clerk of the Council

Attachments A. Revised Work Plan - Vashon Highway Preservation Project CIP 300310

Budget Provisos – Ordinance 15652
Section 58 – Roads
Section 120 – Roads Capital Improvement Program

Revised Work Plan - Vashon Highway Preservation project (CIP 300310)

The Vashon Highway seawall supports 3200 feet of Vashon Highway SW, a principle arterial that serves the entire island. This seawall is in poor condition and has been identified in the county's Vulnerable Road Segments report (April 2006) as a top candidate in need of improvements. The loosely constructed rockery varies in height from 3 to 10 feet. It is composed of poor quality rock and is exposed to southern wave action that repeatedly damages portions of the wall every year. Detailed engineering studies have not yet been completed and development of this project is at the planning level.

This revised work plan is in response King County Council's request to ensure that the alternatives analysis requested by the two provisos of Ordinance 15652, Section 58 - Roads and Section 120 – Roads Capital Improvement Program are incorporated as part of the environmental review for these two projects. The revised work plan outlines how this will be accomplished and provides information on the environmental review process itself.

Scope of Work

Under this revised work plan, the appropriate environmental process will be selected; various alternatives will be analyzed based on evaluative criteria as required by these provisos and the selected environmental review process. Using these evaluative criteria in a comparative process the preferred alternative that best meets the needs of the Vashon Highway Preservation projects will be chosen.

Selecting the Environmental Review Process

Three environmental processes are possible in determining the preferred alternative. State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) processes would be included in each of the following environmental review options:

1) SEPA Environmental Checklist / NEPA Documented Categorical Exemption (CE)

At a minimum, a SEPA Environmental Checklist with a Determination of Non-significance (DNS) would be required and this avenue would be pursued if it were assumed that there probably are no significant adverse impacts. This SEPA process requires only limited public involvement with a 14-day comment period and at least one public meeting, although King County would likely increase public outreach, including the formulation of a Citizen Advisory Group (CAG) to assist in gathering public input. Including the comment period, the checklist process would be complete in roughly six months; however, the Alternatives Analysis would need to be largely completed before work on the checklist could begin, lengthening the schedule. After consultation with Army Corps of Engineers staff, the NEPA Documented CE would simply be a letter from King County to the Corps confirming the exemption from further NEPA process.

2) SEPA Environmental Checklist / NEPA Environmental Assessment (EA)

A SEPA checklist would be completed as mentioned in process 1) above. If there were uncertainty as to whether there were significant adverse impacts, a NEPA EA would be prepared with the Corps assuming NEPA lead agency responsibility for completing that process. Although King County would supply all of the pertinent information, this decision is entirely in the hands of the Corps acting as the NEPA Lead Agency. A formal public process including a CAG would be included in this NEPA process. The timeframe needed to complete this process could be in the 1-2 year range.

3) SEPA / NEPA Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

If the potential impacts of the project are expected to be significant, a Determination of Significance (DS) under SEPA would be issued by King County, and an EIS would be required under both SEPA and NEPA. King County would then act on its own behalf as the SEPA Lead Agency, with the Corps assuming lead agency responsibility under NEPA. This process would include a CAG and extensive public involvement. The EIS could take two or more years to complete but would be preceded with an additional 7-month consultant selection process.

The appropriate environmental process will be chosen by King County in conjunction with the appropriate federal lead agency. In general, the simpler projects can be implemented with only a SEPA Checklist whereas the more complex projects must undergo a SEPA / NEPA Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). An Environmental Assessment (EA) does not review the alternatives as rigorously as an EIS and falls between the checklist and EIS review boundaries.

Factors scrutinized in selecting the appropriate environmental process include:

- Agency and public controversy - ranging from low (checklist) to high (EIS)
- Significance of impacts - ranging from insignificant (checklist) to very significant (EIS)
- Extent of mitigation - ranging from limited (checklist) to extensive (EIS)
- Range of alternatives - ranging from one (checklist) to many (EIS)

There are no clearly defined impact thresholds that mandate which environmental review process must be used for a given project. The principal consideration is whether or not the project is likely to result in significant adverse impacts that warrant a more in-depth analysis of impacts, other alternatives, and potential mitigation measures. Another key factor is the level of controversy that may occur from either agency or public stakeholders. In order to establish which SEPA and NEPA processes are required for this project, additional information will need to be gathered, particularly input from relevant regulatory agencies as well as public stakeholder groups and individuals (particularly those affected directly by prospective alternatives).

Alternatives Development

The alternatives to be examined include reconstructing the seawall and road generally in their current alignment, examination of potential alternative routes, partial or full closure of the road, and a "no build" alternative that perpetuates the past practice of

repairing damage as it occurs. In addition, other possible alternatives will be developed and examined as part of this process. These other, yet to be determined, alternatives may arise from new information or from input from the community and stakeholders involved with the project. From this development process those alternatives that are deemed to be reasonable and feasible will move forward into the environmental review process for further review and analysis.

Alternative Analysis

The alternatives analysis will occur within the environmental review process that has been determined to be appropriate for these projects. In depth studies will be done on each of the alternatives and then compared and evaluated. The following evaluative criteria requested in the provisos will be included at a minimum along with other criteria that may be required by the environmental review process in order to compare and evaluate the alternatives:

- Traffic Operations (Operating Efficiencies)
- Environmental Impacts
- Community/Social Elements
- Traffic Impacts, including Non-motorized Elements
- Historic/Cultural Resource Elements
- Hazardous Material Impacts
- Construction Duration and Impacts
- Project Costs (Cost Efficiencies)
- Life Cycle Costs

Through this comparative process the alternatives will be evaluated and a preferred alternative selected.


Public Outreach

The Road Services Division is keenly aware of the interest by the Vashon Community in this project. It is the Road Services Division's goal that the community is fully informed about the project, has access to inform and provide input to the project team, and is kept up to date with the status and decisions made at each step of this process. The Roads Services Division will seek their input through the establishment of a Citizen Advisory Group, public meetings, project newsletters and a project website.

Schedule

Three possible schedules could result from these three environmental review scenarios. It is important to note that all three schedules are very preliminary and all assume there is no appeal of the documents.

Vashon Highway Preservation schedules



Budget Estimate to Arrive at Preferred Alternative

The following table shows the potential range of costs of arriving at a preferred alternative through each of the three possible environmental review processes.

Schedule A – SEPA Checklist	\$350K	18-month effort
Schedule B – NEPA Environmental Assessment (EA)	\$1.0M	28-month effort
Schedule C – SEPA / NEPA Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)	\$2.5M	42-month effort includes consultant selection process

Tasks

The following tasks requested in the above provisos will be implemented to perform the scope of work:

- Project Management - Coordinate and manage all aspects of work, attend meetings, resolve issues, confirm accuracy and overall quality of the work and deliverables, and complete work on time and within budget.
- Alternatives Analysis - Analyze three or more alternatives including a "no-build" option and alternative roadway alignments. Perform conceptual engineering design to further develop and evaluate alternatives for the purpose of refining structure design, identifying alternate routes and improvements needed, developing cost estimates, aiding public involvement processes and decision making.
- Public Outreach - Inform the public of the alternatives and solicit their input through public meetings. Organize a Citizen Advisory Group and meet regularly with them to solicit their input and keep them informed. Issue project newsletters and maintain a project website.
- Life Cycle Cost / Benefit Analysis - Prepare a life cycle cost analysis for each alternative by developing a detailed estimate of design, construction, right of way, maintenance, and any other tangible costs over the projected life of the alternatives.
- Comparison Matrix - Develop an alternatives comparison matrix, relating each alternative to applicable technical discipline, in order to aid in the comparison of potential impacts across alternatives and the selection of a preferred alternative.