

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

October 9, 2002

Chair Dewhirst called the regular meeting of the Planning Board to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers, Public Safety Complex, 250 – 5th Avenue North.

PRESENT

John Dewhirst, Chair
Jim Crim, Vice Chair
Virginia Cassutt
Janice Freeman
James Young

ABSENT

Joanne Noel
Cary Guenther
Wayne Zhan

STAFF PRESENT

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager
Darrell Smith, Traffic Engineer
Karin Noyes, Recorder

Board Member Guenther and Board Member Noel were excused from the meeting.

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER CRIM MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 25, 2002 AS CORRECTED. BOARD MEMBER YOUNG SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY, WITH BOARD MEMBER CASSUTT ABSTAINING.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

There were no changes made to the proposed agenda.

REQUESTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

Ray Martin, 18704 – 94th Avenue West, said that at the last meeting, Mr. Chave indicated that there was no manipulation of the minutes. But he finds this statement to be baloney. The minutes stated that Board Member Crim was a little bit rude, but he would have worded this statement with a stronger adjective going the other way. The statement would have been better characterized as a melt down or partial loss of self-control. He said that Mr. Chave also stated once or twice at the end of the last meeting that the public is barking up the wrong tree, but these statements do not appear in the minutes. Mr. Chave was referring to the citizens and the City Council. He had hoped these comments would have been included accurately in the minutes.

Mr. Martin recalled that about a year ago, the Planning Board rubberstamped the PRD ordinance that the staff presented and now it is one big mess. He said he would hope that the Board would do a little bit of planning and ask questions to intersect some of these things. The Growth Management Act (GMA) is the law of the land, but it is not a club that can be used to beat everyone into submission. It is a good law and things are going to settle out. They are not going to be shoved down people's throat, and they are not something that allows the City to ignore citizen input or neighborhood character, as is being done now.

Mr. Martin said the revised code of Washington states that the City should encourage citizen participation and coordination and involve the public and citizens in the planning process. They are also supposed to ensure communication between the City and the community to resolve conflicts. The Board will have to work with the public and the City Council a lot more than they have in the past. Mr. Martin suggested that the Board's first mistake was rubberstamping what the planners dumped on their desk. He concluded by stating that his comments were meant to be positive, but they sound negative.

PUBLIC HEARING ON UPDATING THE TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Darrell Smith, Traffic Engineer, explained that the consultant, Ron Loewen, from Bucher, Willis & Ratliff Corporation, would provide a brief overview of the proposed transportation element of the Comprehensive Plan. Then the public would be given an opportunity to provide their comments. He noted that a work session and public hearing would also be conducted at the City Council level in late November or early December after the Planning Board has forwarded their recommendation to them. Staff also plans to amend the SEPA environmental impact statement for the document later this month. The document would be available to the public for review and comment for sixty days.

Mr. Smith said that the staff has received some key comments regarding the proposed plan over the past few weeks. The Cities of Lynnwood and Mountlake Terrace have both written letters of support for the proposed plan. Neither raised concerns. Linda Frasier, who lives on Maple Lane, submitted a request that a crosswalk be installed with the new fire station signal on 196th Avenue. Ruth Perry submitted a petition for a crosswalk at the 212th and 80th Street intersection. Marge Crawford submitted a request that a walkway be installed on 76th Avenue to the north of Meadowdale Beach Road. He noted that the City has also received three other written requests for a walkway in this area. Ms. Crawford also requested that the City allocate more funding for walkways in the City. In addition to the letters that were received, Mr. Smith advised that there were over 100 independent comment sheets received from citizens pointing out traffic situations that are undesirable.

Mr. Loewen explained that they reviewed and updated the goals, objectives and policies for each of the existing categories in the Comprehensive Plan (state and regional context, streets and highways, pedestrian and bicycle pathways, and public transportation). They also added four new categories of goals, objectives and policies (streetscape, capital facilities, traffic calming and air quality). All of these chapters are structured generally the same as the existing document, but the content was reorganized between chapters for easier understanding. For example, the existing analyses and future analyses are located in one section, and inventories and analyses were grouped strictly by mode.

Mr. Loewen advised that an introduction section was added to the plan, and includes a description of the Growth Management Act, a summary of the 2002 public participation opportunities, and an overview of the plan. An inventory section was also added that includes a more detailed assessment of existing roadways, traffic calming, rail and transportation demand management. A travel forecasting model description was added to provide a detailed explanation of the modeling and forecasting processes. In addition, a system analysis was included to identify the proposed approach for potential future projects. Lastly, a recommended plan was provided to identify concepts for traffic calming and the substantial additions to the walkway and bikeway plans.

Mr. Loewen said that, next, they reviewed the existing conditions of the roadways by studying the PM peak hour traffic volumes, which typically identify the highest traffic volumes of the day. They used these traffic counts to prepare a focus of congestion analysis and a level of service analysis. The 16 busiest intersections were analyzed, and they found that six of these locations were at a Level of Service E or F. They also identified the areas where the highest number of accidents occurred and found two roads that had a higher level of accidents: along 212th Street Southwest and 76th Avenue West. He noted that the large red dot in the center of the map identifies the intersection of 212th Street Southwest and 76th Avenue West, which has the highest number of accidents of any intersection in the City.

Mr. Loewen said the traffic volume counts were also used to put together a travel demand forecasting model. First they assessed current land uses by using the Snohomish County Assessor's Map. From this they were able to create transportation analysis zones. They digitized these transportation analysis zones and roadway networks then determined the

trips generated within each zone. They also looked at the Puget Sound Regional Transportation Traffic Volumes for Highway 99 and SR-104. From that they did a model that distributed the trips onto a roadway network. This model was calibrated according to existing traffic conditions. The future land use forecast was applied in order to create a model of future traffic conditions.

Mr. Loewen advised that the future growth on major roadways was identified. It is anticipated that traffic on 196th Street Southwest would increase an average of 1.3 percent per year. The anticipated increase on SR-99 and SR-104 is about 1 percent per year, and the anticipated increase for 76th Avenue West is about .5 percent per year. In addition, it is projected that if no additional roadway improvements are done, 9 of the 16 busiest intersections would be at Level of Service (LOS) E or F by the year 2008. By the year 2020, 13 of the 16 busiest intersections would be at LOS E or F.

When considering potential solutions, Mr. Loewen advised that 19 potential roadway improvement projects were identified by staff, the technical advisory committee, the citizens advisory committee and comments from citizens who attended public meetings. These improvements would address congestion and safety problems identified in the analysis. Each of the projects were ranked using the following criteria: accident statistics, safety analysis, street classification, level of service, mobility, environment, cost effectiveness, right-of-way availability and quality of life. They were placed on a roadway improvement priority matrix according to their criteria scores (see Table 22 in Plan). The projects identified as priorities include:

- A roundabout or signal at the intersection of 76th Avenue and Perrinville.
- Improvements at 76th Avenue and SR-104.
- Improvements at 76th Avenue and 212th Street,
- A signal at 212th and 80th Streets.
- A roundabout or signal at Five Corners.
- Improvements on 84th Street,
- Signals at each end of 220th Street.
- Improvements on 238th Street, with a signal at the SR-104 intersection.
- Widen a short segment of Highway 99.
- Improvements on 76th Avenue at the City limits.
- Signals on 9th Avenue at the intersections of Casper, Main, Walnut and 220th Street.

Mr. Loewen advised that some of the recommended functional classification changes include a reconciliation of the existing City and Federal classifications and the adoption of the most logical classifications from each source. The plan recommends changing the classification of some local access streets to collector streets as warranted by traffic volumes and existing conditions. These changes include:

- 80th Avenue from Olympic View Drive to 200th Street.
- A portion of 200th Street to Maple.
- A portion of 88th
- 95th Avenue from 220th Street to SR-104.
- 96th Avenue from Bowdoin to 220th Street.
- A small portion of 224th going into Snohomish County.

Mr. Loewen said that in reviewing the future level of service, they found that by the year 2008, the LOS conditions would improve significantly if all of the improvements identified in the plan were done. By the year 2020 the majority of the needs would be satisfied, but there would be a potential for problems on SR-104 and SR-99. The plan recommends that as development along these roadways occurs, the staff should continue to work with the Department of Transportation to resolve LOS problems at the trouble intersections.

Mr. Loewen advised that a walkway plan was adopted by the City several years ago, and the new plan identifies additional walkways that could be considered. All of the walkway projects were prioritized using specific criteria to create a list of

recommended walkway projects (See Figure 23). These projects will be spaced throughout the City and the total cost will be about \$2 million.

Mr. Loewen explained that one of the new sections in the document outlines a traffic calming program. This section identifies the procedure that would be followed by the City staff when they receive requests from citizens for traffic calming devices. In addition, the plan includes a section related to bikeways to identify the large and small projects prioritized in the Bikeway Plan. A section related to transit provides guidelines for transit service, and identifies transit supportive land use patterns and established facilities.

Mr. Loewen referred to Table 32, which provides the final list of projects from 2003 to 2023 and identifies anticipated dollar amounts for each. Several of the projects on the list are on-going City programs such as the asphalt overlay and walkway and bikeway programs. He noted that this list includes 14 roadway improvement projects that were identified as priorities. There are also some CIP projects that were retained in the plan.

Next, Mr. Loewen referred to the pie chart illustrating the proposed distribution of capital funds. He noted that 18 percent of the capital funds would be spent on walkways, 9 percent on bikeways, 8 percent on drainage, 30 percent on maintenance and 35 percent on roadways. The capital expenditure total is estimated to be \$37 million. Mr. Loewen referred the Board to the matrix identifying the estimated revenue sources (See Table 33 in Plan). This matrix lists the amount of revenue that is anticipated from each of the nine sources identified.

In conclusion, Mr. Loewen stated that the proposed document is a comprehensive multi-modal plan that represents a substantial update from the 1995 plan. It is based on extensive public input and exceeds the requirements of the Growth Management Act. The recommended plan addresses the present transportation issues, as well as those over the next 20-year planning horizon.

Roger Hertrich, 1020 Puget Drive, said that he reviewed the document to the best of his ability considering its significant size. He said he finds the spacing program that is used to divide the City into areas very interesting. He suggested that the staff and consultant should reexamine why they even have a spacing program in the City. He noted that this type of program is usually used to divide flat lands, but Edmonds has a lot of hills which tend to destroy the spacing program. The clusters of residential housing in Edmonds fit differently into the transportation system.

Mr. Hertrich said that he is also bothered by some of the assumptions and traffic counts that are made in the plan. He noted that the City Council just passed a resolution to go forward with the Arts Center plans. The City will have a functioning arts center in the near future, but this is not included in the list of large regional facilities that is found on Page 75 of the plan. He suggested that a regional arts center would draw people from all over the County. People will use SR-524 coming from Puget Drive via Ninth Avenue, Third Avenue, and Casper Street to access the site. However, the Plan indicates that Third Avenue, Casper Street and SR-524 will all be downgraded from arterial streets to collector streets. He questioned whether or not the State would concur with the classification change for SR-524. He said it is his understanding that a State highway is assigned to take traffic through the area in the shortest distance possible. He questioned how the City could change the classification on this road—especially if there is to be a regional arts facility in the future.

Mr. Hertrich said it appears as though the City is attempting to fix the traffic situation in the north end by sending everyone down Ninth Avenue, instead. If SR-524 is downgraded to a collector street, the City will need to find somewhere else for the traffic to go. This will likely be Ninth Avenue and the residents living on this street will not like the concept. He said that if Ninth Avenue is changed into a main arterial to the south, the street will have to be reconfigured and the street parking will have to be eliminated.

Mr. Hertrich suggested that before traffic lights can be put in on streets, the City must have warrants that justify their installation in order to qualify for State funding. There is no traffic accident history that would warrant the installation of signals on Ninth Avenue. He suggested that the proposed reorientation of traffic into this area would likely be opposed by the citizens living in the area.

Mr. Hertrich referred to Chapter 2, which identifies the Level of Service (LOS) for each of the roads. He said he travels through the intersection at Ninth Avenue and Casper Street at all times of the day, and he has counted the seconds he has had to wait. He said he has not had to wait for any substantial amount of time. Therefore, he questioned the need to install a traffic light at this intersection. He said there do not appear to be any warrants that would support this plan. In addition, Mr. Hertrich said that he finds that the comparisons between the intersection at Ninth Avenue and Main and the intersection at Ninth Avenue and Casper do not equate. He noted that at one point, the numbers indicate that the intersection at Ninth and Main had a shorter wait than the intersection at Ninth and Casper. He suggested that the numbers might have been manipulated.

Mr. Hertrich suggested that future land use is a key issue that must be considered. He noted that Page 78 of the document shows the number of seconds that a person has to wait at each intersection. He suggested that the numbers identified for Ninth and Casper and Ninth and Main are incorrect. Page 81 indicates that the projected growth at Ninth and Casper would increase the wait time to 179 seconds by 2008. If the wait were actually three minutes, traffic would be lined up to Main Street. He suggested that these figures are wrong, as well.

Hank Landau, 23107 – 100th Avenue West, said that he is a property owner in Edmonds and is impressed with and appreciates the work that has been done by the Board, City Engineers and consultants to bring forth the proposed plan. He said he especially appreciates the walkway and bikeway components that have been added. He said he has been a bicyclist for most of his life. In June, while riding a bike on 28th Avenue, he was hit by a car that went through a stop sign. As a result, he said he was nearly killed. He said he has become even more aware of the importance of the bike and pedestrian features that have been incorporated into the proposed plan. He recalled that he was part of the committee that was formed by the Parks Department to consider recreational opportunities in Edmonds. It was determined that one of the greatest deficits was linear parks such as walkways and bikeways. The walkway and bikeway routes proposed in the plan address not only the issue of human transportation, but they also satisfy many of the recreational features that people enjoy. He said he hopes the Board and City Council will look at the proposed document with favor and that funding will be made available to implement the projects proposed so that they can continue to make Edmonds a nicer and safer place to live.

John Vehrs, 7324 – 158th Street Southwest, said he appreciates the work that has been done so far. He said he would like to find out more information about when he can expect the sidewalk on the north side of 76th Avenue to be constructed. He said this is an extremely dangerous place, and he is leary about walking along 76th Avenue at this time. He said there have been numerous near misses, and he would like the City to install the sidewalks in this area as soon as possible before someone gets hurt. They also need more police action in this area.

Also, Mr. Vehrs said that he drives through the Perrinville area all the time, and it seems like the round about that is proposed in this location as a high priority is really not necessary. It is rare that a person has to wait more than one or two cars to get through this intersection, and he urged the staff and consultant to reconsider the project.

David Toyer, Master Builders Association of King and Snohomish County, 2155 – 112 Northeast, Bellevue, complemented the staff and consultant on the tremendous amount of work they put into the proposed document. He said the Master Builders Association was a part of the public process and has been a stakeholder on the citizen advisory committee, as well. They have been working with the staff and consultant to address their concerns, and he suggested that the document is now ready to be forwarded to the City Council for approval. He pointed out that the Transportation Plan is an important element of the Comprehensive Plan. There are three features that need to be addressed: How to deal with growth in the City under the Comprehensive Plan land use component, how to accommodate development and how to improve safety. The proposed plan addresses all three issues.

THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Mr. Smith thanked the citizens for their comments and said that he and the consultant would attempt to answer the questions that were raised. One of the issues was the method by which the City lays out their arterial and collector streets. He said he would like to think that they have applied some reasonable engineering judgment when they reviewed the layout of the streets to make sure they had the appropriate amount of arterials and collectors and that they were spaced properly. He said

it is also important that the streets that are identified as arterials and collectors function properly. Staff did the best they could to make sure there would be a reasonable network of streets that function appropriately.

Mr. Smith advised that the proposed plan identifies the anticipated growth associated with the arts center. They had preliminary information last Spring that was taken into account. They not only addressed the traffic associated with the arts facility and special events, but they also included the increase in traffic related to the housing units that were originally proposed with the project. Since housing is no longer being considered as an option, staff believes that the estimates are very generous.

Regarding the reclassification of SR-524, Mr. Smith explained that this street would still be classified as a minor arterial, so it could continue to function as a State highway. They have not placed a request with the DOT that this be changed from a State highway. He noted that there will always be ferry traffic on this street heading north, regardless of where the ferry terminal is located. However, he agreed that perhaps more language would be appropriate to clarify the intent for this street.

Board Member Dewhirst inquired why the plan changes SR-524 from a major arterial to a minor arterial. Mr. Loewen referred to Figure 2 on Page 15, which is the Federal functional classifications. He explained that SR-524 is classified on the Federal level as a major arterial all the way from Third Avenue to SR-105. However, when the 1995 Transportation Plan was created, SR-524 was classified as a minor arterial down to Third Avenue, and then changes into a minor collector to SR-104. The plan recommends that the Federal classification is higher than it needs to be and the 1995 Transportation Plan classification is more accurate. As time goes on, they could enter into discussions with the DOT if the City wants to change the classification—perhaps when the ferry terminal is relocated.

Mr. Smith explained that there are several types of traffic warrants for both accidents and volume. If there are enough of one or the other filed, some type of traffic calming device can be warranted. He said it is his understanding that in 2000, the City reached the necessary volume of warrants at the intersection of Ninth and Casper to warrant a traffic-calming device. He said that one of his concerns is that people will experience longer and longer delays when trying to make a left hand turn. If the City does not do something to help this situation, people could start to be more aggressive and this could result in a T-bone accident at the intersection. This type of accident would likely be catastrophic because of the high speed of traffic.

Mr. Smith said he would like to meet with John Vehrs to discuss the anticipated date for when the sidewalk improvements along 76th Avenue will come on line. He noted that this project is included in the first five or six projects on the walkway plan, but because the project is very large, it will require the City to secure some type of grant funding. However, he emphasized that there has been a significant amount of public interest expressed on behalf of this project.

Mr. Loewen referred to Page 78 of the Plan, which talks about the length of the delay at each of the intersections. He explained that the type of traffic control device determines the way the delay is measured. At Ninth and Casper Street, the average delay is measured on the minor road. However, he said he would double check to make sure the counts are correct.

Board Member Freeman requested clarification of the bikeway routes that are identified in the Plan. She noted that a lot of bikeways are clearly identified. However, she has not noticed any type of marking for bike lanes on some of the streets that are identified as existing bike routes. Mr. Smith said the bikeway plan has four general types of bicycle facilities. The Interurban Trail is a separate facility for bicycles. Another type of bicycle facility is the bike lanes that are constructed on the edges of some streets. There is a proposed bike lane on 220th Street. There are also bike facilities that are, basically, signed only to identify that the street is a good route for a biker to use. In order to be signed as a bike route, streets need to be a minimum of 14 feet wide per lane and must be able to allocate four or more feet for the bicycles. He noted that Ninth Avenue was signed this past year as a bike route from Casper Street all the way to 15th Avenue. There has been some debate about whether the City should do more for bicycles on Ninth Avenue, but this would require that the on-street parking the existing residents use would have to be eliminated.

Mr. Smith said the primary function of a roadway is to move people and provide access to the adjacent property owners. The definition of a street does not include provisions for parking for the private property owners. Therefore, parking is not really the City's priority. However, it is tough to sell this concept to someone who has enjoyed on-street parking for a long time.

Board Member Freeman inquired where bicyclists go on Fifth Avenue, which is designated on the map as a bike route. Mr. Smith answered that if an opportunity arises, the City would like to put a bike lane on Fifth Avenue. But at this time, there is no bike facility on Fifth Avenue, and there probably won't be any time soon. He said he would research this road more in order to provide a better answer to Board Member Freeman.

Board Member Freeman noted that somewhere in the plan it states that walkways should be provided to significant destinations. If the City wants to encourage public transportation, they need to realize that sidewalks are a major component of public transportation. People need to be able to access the bus stops safely at all times. Mr. Smith said Community Transit approached the City and asked them to make sure that providing connectivity to the transit stops becomes a high priority in the Transportation Plan.

Mr. Smith explained that the official street map identifies all of the streets within the City. In addition, they tried to project the future. If development occurs, the City will be asking for certain rights-of-way to be deeded to the City to facilitate the improvements identified in the Plan.

Board Member Dewhirst said it is his understanding that, at this time, the City does not have a mitigation fee program. Mr. Smith said that right now, the only way the City can ask for mitigation fees for projects is if the development proposal triggers a SEPA review. These applications also require a traffic impact analysis. Projects that do not require a SEPA review would not be required to provide mitigation fees, either. The mitigation fee for smaller developments is \$200 per home. For the larger projects, staff analyzes where the improvements need to be made and then figures out what the mitigation fees should be based on the improvements that need to occur. He explained that once the Transportation Plan is adopted, the staff will come back before the Board with a concurrency plan to allow the City to collect a proportional fee to mitigate the impacts. However, the Board must remember that they cannot expect a new developer to take care of the existing traffic problems.

Board Member Dewhirst referred to Table 3, which identifies \$6 million from mitigation fees as a possible source of revenue. Since this revenue would require some type of political process, there is no guarantee that the money will be available at this point. He said he has the same concerns regarding the joint funding that is identified from Snohomish County for the 84th Street project. He said he has talked with people from the County, and they indicate that this project is not even on their plans at this time, and probably won't be added in the near future. He is also concerned about the revenue source that is identified from the City of Lynnwood for the project on 76th Avenue. Lynnwood has had this money for the past five years and hasn't done much with it to date. He concluded that almost 1/3 of the revenue identified is very questionable. He said he did not see any contingency statements about what would happen if the revenues do not come out as estimated. Mr. Smith said that Randy Young is present to answer funding questions. He will also address the legality issue surrounding the inclusion of a contingency in the plan when the City plans to ask for mitigation fees at the same time.

Mr. Smith said he spoke with three officials at Snohomish County regarding the 84th Street project, who indicated that the project is far off in their plans. However, two of the projects identified in the proposed Transportation Plan (84th Street and 238th Street) will be pushed forward through the regional transportation improvement bond (RTIB). He agreed that the City staff needs to start discussions with the County to make sure they are on board if funding becomes available from the RTIB. If the County does not want to do their portion of the project, the City will do just their portion up to the County line and the portion in Snohomish County would not get done. Board Member Dewhirst said it is important to make sure the public knows that other things like walkways would not take the hit to pay for the rest of the project if Snohomish County decides not to participate. Mr. Smith agreed that they should carefully budget their expenditures to identify the portions that will be spent on each type of project.

Board Member Dewhirst said there are a lot of areas in Edmonds that could use sidewalks. He said he does not want to give false hope to the public that projects will get done if money starts to disappear.

Randy Young, Henderson, Young and Company, explained that it is both common practice and legal in Washington for long range transportation plans to include proposals for money that is not in hand. If they were restricted to making plans with money that is in the bank, they would end up with very modest plans. Just because the City is allowed to put out documents identifying contingency plans, that does not mean that they can go on forever if they fail to get the money. That is why plans

are subject to periodical updates. As new information is available and annual budgets are identified, changes can be made to the policies without changing the entire Transportation Plan. Before mitigation payments can become a reality, the City will need to disclose the list of projects that can be funded with mitigation fees. Mr. Young explained that, at this time, the funding sources that have been identified are \$6.5 million short of what is needed to do the priority projects identified in the Plan. He said part of his job is to determine whether or not this amount could be attributed to mitigation fees or not. He said after further analysis, he is confident that mitigation fees could cover the additional \$6.5 million that is needed for implementation. Once the plan is approved, they can begin to calibrate the fees for future development

Board Member Young asked what type of action is required of the Board at this time. Board Member Dewhirst explained that the Board has the ability to make a recommendation to the City Council now, or they could postpone their recommendation to allow time for the Board to further scrutinize the document and act on it later. They also have the option of continuing the public hearing to a date certain.

Board Member Young suggested that because the document contains information related to the capital improvement project (CIP) budget, perhaps there is a deadline by which the Board should make their recommendation to the City Council. Mr. Smith explained that there is a separate CIP process that the City goes through every year, so there is no deadline for approval of the Transportation Plan. However, it is important that the CIP that is approved as part of the budget process match what is being proposed for the Comprehensive Plan.

Board Member Young inquired how the City handles individual and group requests for traffic mitigation measures. Mr. Smith answered that any correspondence that comes into the City Engineer's office is logged into an electronic database. The staff follows these requests through by contacting the individual and trying to resolve the issue. It is normal for staff to receive petitions of this type. He said that, typically, he would do a field investigation of the situation before bringing the issue before the City Engineer and the Community and Development Services Director. If appropriate, it is brought to the Mayor's attention, as well. He noted that the City received several petitions this past year asking for projects that are identified in the proposed Plan. These requests are simple to handle because they are already in the plan for implementation.

Board Member Young inquired regarding the relative certainty of the estimated 20-year revenue. He said he can understand the City staff's perspective on mitigation fees and that they can reasonably expect to collect \$6 million. But it seems that it is worth at least a footnote in the document to point out that the mitigation fee concept has not been approved yet. They should also point out that the \$4 million from Snohomish County would be spent in Snohomish County and not Edmonds. A footnote could state that if the County does not provide this funding, the improvements would only be made up to the County line. He urged the staff to include notes such as these in the table that identifies the funding sources.

Board Member Young referred to the revenue that is anticipated from the motor vehicle registration fee, and suggested that this also deserves a footnote because the money could go away if Initiative 776 is approved by the voters this fall. Mr. Smith said that while he must remain neutral on the proposed initiative, it is important for the City to understand that if it is approved, they will have \$300,000 less per year to use for transportation improvement projects. Right now, staff anticipates that this amount would be deducted from the budget identified for overlay projects. Board Member Young said it is important that the public have a clear understanding of the impact that Initiative 776 would have on the transportation budget. He also questioned if the motor vehicle tax is dependent upon voter approval. Mr. Young answered that the revenue from the motor vehicle tax is not part of Referendum 51. The City already receives the motor vehicle tax revenue that is allocated by the State based on a population formula. Mr. Smith said that R-51 would provide up to 2.2 million for the Edmonds Crossing Project if approved. This money could be used to help the City leverage grants that are already in place by providing funds for local match. Referendum 51 also identifies money within Edmonds for sidewalks—especially those in school zones.

Board Member Young said that he read the entire Transportation Plan document and appreciates and compliments the staff and consultant on the summary they provided in the power point presentation. Board Member Young asked that the consultants and staff make one summary statement about the pie chart and how the expenditures summarize and support all of the information in the Plan as well as the work of the citizens advisory committees. He said the funding allocation that is represented in the pie chart seems to be very prudent, but he would like to have the transportation consultant tell him why.

This could be used as either an introduction or wrap up comment when the presentation is made to the City Council. The footnotes that he suggested earlier should also be added to the document and pointed out to the City Council.

Mr. Smith said that Board Member Young's questions is well taken, and he would like to spend some time to come up with a thoughtful answer. But the pie chart makes it apparent that the plan is well balanced. He pointed out that the focus is on capital improvement projects. However, they do have a budget for maintenance costs as part of the public works budget.

Board Member Dewhirst agreed with Board Member Young that the staff and consultant have done a good job preparing the proposed document, but now it needs to be brought together into some type of summary for presentation of the significant points to the public and City Council. The question that will be foremost on the City Council's mind will be whether or not the City can afford the proposed plan. They will want to have a clear indication of the answer to this question without having to spend a significant amount of time reviewing the document.

Board Member Dewhirst suggested that the staff and consultants be given about a month to bring a summary that will answer the question identified back to the Board on November 13. That would still allow time to get the document to the City Council on schedule. Mr. Smith said he would have to take a close look at the schedule because he was anticipating that the Board would be able make some proposed changes to the Plan and then take action tonight and forward it to the City Council. He requested that the Board provide additional direction about exactly what they are seeking from staff and the consultant for the next meeting. He noted that the document has a tremendous amount of information. The public also provided some good comments that point out the need to provide clarification of some issues. He said he would like to brainstorm with some of the Board members after the meeting to make sure that they can provide the information the Board is seeking.

Board Member Cassutt agreed and said it would help the staff get the document through the City Council's review and approval process if a thorough summary is done to answer issues about funding, in particular. Mr. Smith said he is comfortable with the funding package that is being proposed, and he does not feel they have overextended their revenues. He explained that one of the challenges is to continue to make Edmonds a pedestrian friendly community, and they are fortunate that they do not have some of the congestion problems that other cities are facing. If staff is confident in the funding proposal, Board Member Cassutt suggested that this be made more clear in the document. Board Member Young added that it is important for the Board to be more comfortable with the funding before they make a recommendation to the Council.

Board Member Young suggested that because the participants on the citizens advisory committees work hard and are very articulate, perhaps one of these members could be invited to come before the Board at their next meeting to provide further information and insight.

THE BOARD TOOK A TEN-MINUTE BREAK AT 8:40 P.M. THEY RECONVENED AT 8:50 P.M.

WORK SESSION ON BUILDABLE LANDS AND CONSIDERATION OF "REASONABLE MEASURES" TO COMPLY WITH BUILDABLE LANDS REQUIREMENTS UNDER GMA

Mr. Chave said that this item is a continuation of the Board's discussions regarding buildable lands. He reminded the Board that they recently forwarded a report to the City Council regarding buildable lands issues. The follow up is that when jurisdictions are looking at the buildable lands report, they also need to look at reasonable measures to achieve target densities and growth within the jurisdiction. At this time, Edmonds is not achieving the population growth that had been projected for the years 2002 to 2012. They need to consider whether there are other measures that could be implemented.

Mr. Chave said the purpose of tonight's discussion is to review some of the reasonable measures that have been identified by the State and County, as well as one citizen proposal. If the Board feels it is appropriate, they have the ability to forward some suggestions to the City Council on ways the City could encourage infill that is consistent with the Growth Management Act (GMA). They could also highlight what the City has already done. While they have made progress, there could be some other things the City should look at. He suggested, however, that is not something the Board wants to just embark on

APPROVED

without specific direction from the City Council. The Board should probably seek feedback from the City Council as to which reasonable measures they want the Board to pursue.

Board Member Dewhirst noted that the salmon paper that was provided by staff indicates that a public hearing would need to be held. Mr. Chave clarified that the County Council held the public hearing when they undertook the buildable lands report for this year. The City was not responsible for doing their own report, but they are left with the “cleanup” of trying to consider how they can improve the situation. He noted that there is no time frame for this project. They could discuss the ideas tonight and request additional information from the staff at a future meeting.

Board Member Dewhirst said that Mr. Gard has been patient and tried various avenues to develop his property. He said that one thing that concerns him is the City Attorney’s interpretation of the PRD ordinance criteria that allows rounding up to the next unit. He felt that this would constitute a rezone. This same concern could apply if the Board were to recommend to the City Council that an additional unit be allowed if a certain percentage of the density is available. He inquired if this would be considered a type of defacto rezoning, as well. Since the record is clear as to Mr. Gard’s request, perhaps the staff should provide this information to the City Attorney and request his opinion. Mr. Chave said his understanding is that if the opportunity is made available to anyone within the zone, then this allowance would be okay. Board Member Dewhirst said he would like to see this in writing from the City Attorney before the Board makes a recommendation on whether or not to pursue the concept further.

Board Member Young said he would like to see flexibility given to the Planning Department staff when reviewing subdivisions. For example, there could be a rule in the ECDC that states that all lots shall be consistent with the underlying zoning within a certain small percentage? This would resolve Mr. Gard’s situation, but also situations where subdivisions are designed in strange manners because they are short a small amount of square footage. Board Member Young inquired if the staff would feel comfortable being responsible for this type of flexibility. Mr. Chave answered that if the rules are clear, staff could administer the standards, but if the rules are not clear it would be difficult to apply.

Mr. Chave said that the City Attorney, Mr. Snyder, has volunteered to come to a Planning Board meeting to talk about density issues for PRD’s and so forth. When they get to the extended agenda portion of the meeting, the Board could identify a meeting date for this discussion to take place. The Board agreed that this discussion would be helpful.

Board Member Dewhirst said that in going through the list of reasonable measures, he found that Edmonds has already implemented a number of them. However, the one item that jumps out at him is that if the City is supposed to provide for more density without upsetting the existing property owners, one option would be to pursue opportunities for more dense development along the Highway 99 corridor. Any number of the tools outlined as reasonable measures could be implemented along the highway. Mr. Chave advised that Mr. Bowman is working on getting City Council agreement to establish a Highway 99 task force to get serious about these issues.

Board Member Dewhirst pointed out that Edmonds is running out of land for development, and the downtown is becoming denser. The only thing that could be done is to start considering height increases, but he is not excited about starting this discussion. The other option is to do infill development (like PRD’s) or encourage larger landholders to subdivide their properties. He recalled that the City opted to encourage more and smaller single-family residential development rather than multi-family development. Mr. Chave pointed out that land values play a lot into what happens in Edmonds. They haven’t seen a need to have maximum lot size requirements in the City because no one seems to ask for lots that are larger than the size allowed in the zone. He concluded that the market drives development towards the infill level.

Mr. Chave said a few things the City could consider doing includes the reduction of street widths or allowing cottage housing. There is an application going before the City Council for a PRD in a multi-family zone. Perhaps this should be a type for use to encourage in the multi-family zones outright rather than requiring a PRD approval.

Board Member Freeman inquired if there is a size requirement for the condos that are being built in the multi-family zones. She said it seems that the new condominiums are much larger than the older ones, and this does not result in an increase in density. Mr. Chave said there are no limitations on the size of the multi-family units. Generally, the market drives the size and number of units that are developed. Board Member Freeman suggested that it would be beneficial to the citizens if

smaller, high-quality units were built so that older people could stay in their same neighborhoods after they sell their larger homes. This would result in an increase in density. Very few people can afford to purchase the larger units that are being built.

Board Member Young inquired if the City has somehow been identified as an area that has not met their population projections, and therefore, they are looked at as being in violation of the GMA requirements. Or are they holding this discussion as part of the Planning Board's obligation to look at the generic question of whether they are doing enough to encourage infill in Edmonds? Mr. Chave said the City is not in violation of the Growth Management Act. The buildable lands review is not the kind of review where a specific target population is identified and the City has to achieve it or else. However, it is important for the City to identify where they stand relative to the population projections because in two years they will be agreeing to a new set of population targets that they will have to plan for. Since they are doing the buildable lands analysis now, this is the best time to analyze where they are and determine where they want to go.

Board Member Crim said that if the trend of population increase continues, the City could be found in a position of violation unless changes are made. Mr. Chave said the Southwest Snohomish County area did achieve their targets. However, if they look at each individual City in the Southwest Snohomish County urban growth area, the City has not met their target numbers. But the City has been doing their part to make sure that infill development occurs, and it is important to have all of the facts that support this in hand so that they know what they are capable of when the next targets are established.

Board Member Young recalled that at the last workshop, Mr. Chave noted the significant amount of large lot development in Edmonds. He pointed out that because of the topography, some of the lots have to be large in order to protect critical areas and steep slopes, etc. Theoretically, smaller lots could be created, but development of the lots would be expensive because of the need to address steep slope issues. Board Member Young questioned whether the growth target that was identified for Edmonds was even reasonable to begin with. If there is not a lot of buildable land in Edmonds, whatever is left will be expensive, and cutting the property into smaller lots will not make the development less costly. Mr. Chave said that one argument would be that a significant amount of development could take place in the undeveloped areas of the County rather than in Edmonds, since Edmonds is built out for the most part. He said it might be necessary for the City to provide a lot more justification for their large lot zoning over the next few years. As a general rule, he would agree that they have justification for the larger lots, but they need to be more thorough.

Board Member Crim suggested that part of the challenge is educating the citizens so that they better understand the choices the City is facing. This could be accomplished, in part, by some type of coordinated community workshop that deals with the issue of how Edmonds should accommodate increased population. This is something that has not been done yet. Mr. Chave agreed, and said the time to do this type of workshop is during the next two-year period. He noted that two years ago the City conducted a visioning process that focused on the downtown, but included the City as a whole. They need to follow up and build on the product to see what the implications are for the community at large. They could then make adjustments to the 1995 plan to target the suggestions made in the review.

Mr. Chave suggested that now that the Board has identified a few options, they should consider a date to invite the City Attorney for more detailed discussions. Staff could try and summarize what the Board has discussed thus far.

Board Member Freeman pointed out that in the area of Mr. Gard's property, there are properties that are different in size from large to small lots. Therefore, small lots in this area would not be out of character with surrounding development.

Board Member Dewhirst suggested that it might be helpful to obtain a copy of the City of Shoreline's cottage housing ordinance. They will be having an APA brown bag meeting on this ordinance that staff should consider attending. Board Member Dewhirst said that if the Board chooses to consider this option, it would be important to create a zone that is specific for this use.

CONTINUED REVIEW OF COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS FOR 2002

APPROVED

Mr. Chave announced that the two rezone hearings that were tentatively scheduled for October 23 will have to be postponed until November 13. The public hearing on the public urban design and street tree plan is scheduled for October 23. On November 13, the Board will wrap up their review of the Transportation Plan.

Mr. Chave advised that the medical/hospital zoning was discussed by the Board earlier in the year. They had promised the neighborhood community that they would meet with them to talk about this issue some more. Board Member Dewhirst suggested that this issue would be better discussed by the Highway 99 Task Force, first.

Mr. Chave explained that the Board has the option of either deferring to the Highway 99 Task Force or they could consider some of the simple changes for the multi-family zones in the area to make a mixed use zone without adjusting the heights or dealing with the issue of allowing medical uses in the zone outright. They could choose to simply clean up some of the issues with the mixed-use zone that wouldn't involve a tremendous increase in density.

Board Member Crim inquired how soon the task force would be formed. Mr. Chave said that Mr. Bowman plans to get feedback from the City Council as to their support before he launches into this major project. As soon as he gets this feedback, he will begin forming the group, but he expects it will be well into next year. Board Member Crim said that if it were known that the task force was going to go forward, he would like to postpone the entire issue. But if it is not going to get started until late next year, the Board probably should do some clean up work on an interim basis. Mr. Chave suggested that the Board wait until Mr. Bowman can provide a report on the time frame for the Highway 99 Task Force before making their decision.

Board Member Cassutt suggested that since the taskforce will probably not get started for at least six months, at best, the Board should probably attempt to clean up the other problems that have arisen in the area without changing the height limit. Board Member Crim suggested that it would be less confusing to the public if only one amendment process were used rather than two. Mr. Chave said he would get more information to the Board regarding the time frame for the task force. The Board could then make their decision.

Mr. Chave announced that, in light of the added work of reviewing the PRD ordinance as requested by the City Council, the Board will not have an opportunity to update the Comprehensive Plan Map this year. This project will have to be postponed until next year.

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

Board Member Dewhirst noted that the second meeting in November is one week earlier, November 20, to accommodate the Thanksgiving Holiday. He also noted that there would only be one meeting in December.

Board Member Dewhirst reviewed that on October 23rd, the agenda will include a public hearing on the Public Urban Design and Street Tree Plan. The staff will also bring back the draft list of reasonable measures for further Board review. On November 13, the Board will have further discussion on the Transportation Plan, as well as two public hearings on rezone applications. On November 20, the City Attorney would be invited to speak with the Board regarding the issue of reasonable measures.

Mr. Chave advised that the City Council would receive the Board's report on PRD's next week, so he anticipates they will establish a time frame for this work and provide further direction. In addition, Mr. Chave said the Community Services Committee discussed the issue of fences and hedges at their last meeting. They have recommended that the issue be presented to the entire City Council for further review.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

Board Member Dewhirst said he heard a report that the City anticipates a reduction in staff. He inquired how this would impact the Planning Department. Mr. Chave answered that the Mayor will be presenting a budget proposal that will

APPROVED

probably have a 10 to 11 percent reduction in staff. The Finance Department has done a thorough analysis looking four to five years down the road. Assuming the current revenue stream, they need to make adjustments now. If they do, they will be in better shape in the future.

Board Member Dewhirst said he discussed this issue with the Community Development Director, who indicated that if the Planning Department staff is better suited to other projects, the City may have to seriously consider reducing the number of Planning Board meetings to one per month. While this will draw issues out over a longer period of time, it will save staff time.

Mr. Chave advised that the Mayor's office and other Departments are being extremely creative in their thought process. But, the cuts will mean a change in the way the City does business in a lot of different ways.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

There were no Planning Board Member comments during this portion of the meeting.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 9:37 p.m.

APPROVED