

**FISCAL NOTE FOR NON-CAPITAL PROJECTS**

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Contact Person/Phone:</b>	<b>CBO Analyst/Phone:</b>
Legislative	Traci Ratzliff 4-8153	Doug Palmer 4-5266

**Legislation Title:** A RESOLUTION approving the Seattle Bicycle Master Plan

**Summary of the Legislation:**

This legislation states the City Council’s intent to approve the Seattle Bicycle Master Plan. The plan defines the set of actions to be completed in order to achieve the key vision for the BMP: “Riding a bicycle is a comfortable integral part of daily life in Seattle for people of all ages and abilities.”

**Background:**

In 2007, the Seattle City Council passed Ordinance 122386 establishing a Complete Streets policy and stating the Council’s intention that the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) implement Complete Streets by designing, operating, and maintaining the transportation network to improve travel conditions for pedestrians, bicyclists, transit, and freight, in a manner consistent with and supportive of the surrounding community.

In 2007, the City Council adopted Resolution 31024, approving the City’s Bicycle Master Plan, which contained a map showing where bicycle facility improvements should be made, and identified a number of actions to improve conditions for bicycling in the city.

As part of the 2012 Budget, the City Council included funding for an update to the Bicycle Master Plan, and provided direction that the plan should include review and incorporation of national best practices (including use of the National Association of Transportation Officials (NACTO) Urban Bikeway Design Guidelines), include facilities not in the 2007 plan, specifically cycle tracks (protected bicycle lanes) and neighborhood greenways, and contain a prioritization framework.

The BMP was developed over the past 18 months in partnership with City Council, the Executive, the Seattle Bicycle Advisory Board, and interested stakeholders. Over 3,500 responded to an on-line survey that identified benefits and challenges to the existing bike network and opportunities for system improvements. Staff hosted 7 community open house meetings, attended a large number of community group meetings, and briefed a number of City boards and commissions, including the Freight Advisory Board, the Pedestrian Advisory Board, and the Planning Commission. More than 1,000 comments were received and considered on the draft Bicycle Master Plan.

**x This legislation does not have any financial implications.**

(Please skip to “Other Implications” section at the end of the document and answer questions a-h. Earlier sections that are left blank should be deleted. Please delete the instructions provided in parentheses at the end of each question.)

Approving the Seattle Bicycle Master Plan has no fiscal implications. However, it is important to state that appropriations to support the plan implementation will be part of subsequent years’ budget processes.

**\_\_\_\_\_ This legislation has financial implications.**

(If the legislation has direct fiscal impacts (e.g., appropriations, revenue, positions), fill out the relevant sections below. If the financial implications are indirect or longer-term, describe them in narrative in the “Other Implications” Section. Please delete the instructions provided in parentheses at the end of each title and question.)

**Other Implications:**

**a) Does the legislation have indirect financial implications, or long-term implications?**

(If yes, explain them here.)

No -- but appropriations to support the plan implementation will be part of subsequent years’ budget processes

**b) What is the financial cost of not implementing the legislation?**

(Estimate the costs to the City of not implementing the legislation, including estimated costs to maintain or expand an existing facility or the cost avoidance due to replacement of an existing facility, potential conflicts with regulatory requirements, or other potential costs.)

None

**c) Does this legislation affect any departments besides the originating department?**

(If so, please list the affected department(s), the nature of the impact (financial, operational, etc), and indicate which staff members in the other department(s) are aware of the proposed legislation.)

No

**d) What are the possible alternatives to the legislation that could achieve the same or similar objectives?** (Include any potential alternatives to the proposed legislation, such as reducing fee-supported activities, identifying outside funding sources for fee-supported activities, etc.)

None.

**e) Is a public hearing required for this legislation?**

(If yes, what public hearing(s) have been held to date, and/or what public hearing(s) are planned for the future?)

No

**f) Is publication of notice with *The Daily Journal of Commerce* and/or *The Seattle Times* required for this legislation?**

(For example, legislation related to sale of surplus property, condemnation, or certain capital projects with private partners may require publication of notice. If you aren’t sure, please check with your lawyer. If publication of notice is required, describe any steps taken to comply with that requirement.)

No

**g) Does this legislation affect a piece of property?**

(If yes, and if a map or other visual representation of the property is not already included as an exhibit or attachment to the legislation itself, then you must include a map and/or other visual representation of the property and its location as an attachment to the fiscal note. Place a note on the map attached to the fiscal note that indicates the map is intended for illustrative or informational purposes only and is not intended to modify anything in the legislation.)

No

**h) Other Issues:**