

APPROVED FEBRUARY 27<sup>TH</sup>

## CITY OF EDMONDS PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

February 13, 2008

---

---

Chair Guenther called the meeting of the Edmonds Planning Board to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers, Public Safety Complex, 259 – 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue North.

### **BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT**

Cary Guenther, Chair  
John Dewhirst  
Jim Young  
Don Henderson  
John Reed

### **STAFF PRESENT**

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager  
Noel Miller, Public Works Director  
Don Fiene, Assistant City Engineer  
ReNee McRae, Recreation Manager  
Brian McIntosh, Parks, Recreation and Open Space Director  
Karin Noyes, Recorder

### **BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT**

Michael Bowman, Vice Chair  
Judith Works

Vice Chair Bowman and Board Member Works were excused from the meeting.

### **READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**BOARD MEMBER REED MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 23, 2008 BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. BOARD MEMBER DEWHIRST SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY, WITH CHAIR GUENTHER ABSTAINING.**

### **ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA**

No changes were made to the agenda.

### **AUDIENCE COMMENTS**

**Al Rutledge** said he attended the Board's last meeting, and it was interesting to see that the City Council and Board work together on the codes. He said he was present to hear the presentation on the Stevens Hospital Master Plan. He encouraged the Board Members to attend the Stevens Hospital Board Meetings and get more involved in their process.

### **PRESENTATION BY SARAH ZABEL ON STEVENS HOSPITAL MASTER PLAN**

Sarah Zabel, Stevens Hospital Planning Officer, said she was present to provide an overview of the hospital's master site plan. She reviewed that the hospital's vision is to improve the health and well-being of the community through local, high-quality and compassionate healthcare services. Their vision is to be a trusted and financially strong provider of high-quality health care services who collaborates with others to creatively respond to the health needs of a diverse community. Ms. Zabel shared a brief history of the hospital by noting that the hospital district was established by voters in 1962, and the 110-bed hospital officially opened its doors on January 30, 1964. The facility was named after Isaac Ingalls Stevens, the first governor of the Washington Territory. She provided pictures of the original hospital building, which is still in use. She also

provided a more recent photograph of the existing hospital. She advised that in 2007, the daily census at the hospital was 91, and that is anticipated to increase to 127 by the year 2017. They currently have 20 Emergency Department positions and this is expected to increase to about 41. They anticipate the need to increase the number of beds from the existing 120 to 181.

Ms. Zabel pointed out that population in the hospital's primary service area is expected to grow by more than 20,000 people over the next four years, and approximately 45% of the growth would come from the 65+ age group. They also anticipate a continued reduction in the amount of reimbursement they receive from government payers. The hospital has struggled for several years with a negative bottom line net income. However, in 2007 the hospital met its bottom line for net income for the first time. In addition, they provided more than \$5.3 million in charity care. She provided a chart to illustrate the hospital's net income from 2004 to 2008.

Ms. Zabel provided a map to illustrate the hospital's service area and noted that at least 80% of their patients come from within the service area. She also provided a chart comparing the quality of Stevens Hospital with other facilities in the region and noted that Stevens Hospital offers quality care.

Ms. Zabel reported that in 2005 Stevens Hospital developed their first strategic plan to guide them through 2006 to 2008. The plan called for development of a master site and facilities plan. Callison was hired as a consultant in early 2007 to aid in this task, and a task force was also formed in 2007. The task force identified the following key attributes for the proposed master site and facilities plan:

- Clear organization and intuitive way finding. It is important to consider the organization of the campus as new construction is planned and developed.
- Campus feel, including a campus green area. It is important to be a center for maintaining health and wellness, as well as a place that cares for sick people.
- State of the art facilities and equipment.
- A design that is tied to best practices for quality. There have been many studies that link a patient's recovery time to the view they are able to see from their window.
- Easy access to parking. One real struggle for people who go to hospitals for care is that they have to pay for parking and parking is very limited.
- Flexible future. The health care industry changes rapidly, and it is important to have a flexible design to meet the changing needs.

Ms. Zabel referred to a map providing an overview of the current master plan and specifically noted the following:

- The existing west tower would remain, but it would be used for alternative uses such as rehabilitation, assisted living, long-term care, etc.
- The original 1964 building would be demolished and replaced, since it would cost more to remodel the existing building than to construct a new one.
- A new tower would be constructed to the northeast of the existing hospital structure.
- The existing plant would be maintained and a parking structure would be added.
- A campus green area would be created to the south of the new hospital.
- The existing Stevens Pavilion would remain, as would the oncology building.

Ms. Zabel said that, at this time, it is difficult to identify the front entrance to the hospital. With the new plan, the Highway 99 access would become the focal point and main entry to the hospital. The goal is to provide a boulevard type feel at this entrance and clear signage to identify it as the main entrance. She said the hospital owns the existing Value Village site, which is under lease until the year 2013, but their long-range plan calls for some type of hospital related use at this location in the future. The Kreuger Clinic Building is under new ownership, and upgrades to the property are anticipated. The goal is to tie the facility into the hospital.

Ms. Zabel provided a drawing to illustrate what the new hospital might look like. She advised that the facility would probably include a 9-story structure, but no design has been developed to date. The estimated cost of the new facility is

about \$400 billion, and they anticipate that construction costs would continue to escalate. It is important for the hospital district to consider all opportunities for funding the new facility in the future. If they are going to move forward with this costly plan, they must also be absolutely certain they are in the right location. No decisions have been made one way or the other regarding location. No final decisions related to design would be made until the issues of location and funding have been addressed.

Ms. Zabel advised there are currently 43 hospital districts in the State of Washington, and the median tax levy rate is about \$.45. The Stevens Hospital tax levy rate is only \$.09. Although they are the third largest hospital district in the state, they fall near the bottom in tax dollars collected.

Ms. Zabel said the hospital board has determined that, within 20 years, the existing hospital would be unable to meet the needs of the community. Capital funding options include levy and bond opportunities. They may also consider partnership opportunities in order to provide adequate and quality services to the community in the future. However, funding decisions would not be made until decisions related to location have been made.

Board Member Dewhirst inquired if the hospital is currently considering any other specific sites for the hospital. Ms. Zabel answered that the hospital board has not considered any specific locations at this time. However, when considering the primary service area, moving the facility to the east seems an appropriate option to consider. Board Member Dewhirst asked if the board has identified criteria to help them make this decision. Ms. Zabel said they have not. Board Member Dewhirst inquired regarding the timeframe for the master plan. Ms. Zabel answered that the board is still in the process of developing the time line. Board Member Dewhirst expressed concern about how the City would be impacted if the hospital were to relocate elsewhere. He noted that Edmonds has invested a significant amount of money and time in the hospital, and he suggested it would be appropriate for City officials to have a serious discussion with the hospital before a decision is made. He emphasized that the hospital and the ancillary health care offices located around the hospital offer numerous employment opportunities for the community.

Ms. Zabel emphasized that the hospital loves their location in Edmonds, and it would not be an easy decision to relocate. Many medical staff have made investments in the area and they need the hospital in order to continue in their current locations. These individuals would play a large part in the location decision. Board Member Dewhirst asked if the hospital board has considered the option of having two sites: one in the north and one in the south. Ms. Zabel said the board has not eliminated any potential options at this point, and they may consider the opportunity to construct a second facility at another location.

Board Member Young noted that the Highway 99 Task Force previously expressed their opinion that the Stevens Hospital site was underutilized. He questioned how the proposed plan would address this issue. Ms. Zabel said the hospital is close to capacity nearly all the time. However, the term underutilized refers more to market share, and she agreed that the hospital should be drawing a larger portion of the community to their facility, particularly for services that require frequent care. Right now, the hospital has a limited ability to expand what they can do in this regard. They currently have 130 inpatient beds, and many times they do not have space for more patients. They need to look for ways to add more beds and more services. Stevens Hospital has 42,000 emergency visits per year, and most facilities with this amount of activity have four times the space. She summarized that the hospital is quickly outgrowing the facility, and they have very little ability to expand their services.

Board Member Young inquired if the hospital board has identified a more strategic location in the service area that would provide better access. He noted that the current location is off in the corner of the service area, and a better location would probably be in the middle of the service area. Ms. Zabel agreed it would make sense for the hospital to have more presence near the center of the service area, but that doesn't mean they have to move the hospital in order to provide this presence.

**PUBLIC HEARING ON DRAFT DESIGN STANDARDS AND DESIGN REVIEW PROCESS FOR DOWNTOWN RETAIL CORE (PROPERTIES IN THE BD1 ZONE)**

Mr. Chave announced that the public hearing is related to a proposal by the Edmonds Historic Preservation Commission (HPC), with input from the Architectural Design Board (ADB) and Planning Board. He explained that the initial proposal

**APPROVED**

from the HPC was forwarded to the Planning Board by the City Council in June of 2007. The ADB completed its review of the proposal in December of 2007, and their comments were forwarded to the Planning Board in January of 2008. Once the Planning Board has completed their review and forwarded a recommendation to the City Council, the City Council would conduct a final public hearing before making a decision.

Mr. Chave explained that the proposed language is intended to provide more specificity and design standards for the BD1 zone, which consists of the few blocks around the fountain. When the HPC and City Council initially reviewed the issue, they determined this area was a key part of the downtown and sets the character and flavor for the downtown. They wanted to make sure clear standards were established for future redevelopment or change that occurs in the BD1 zone.

Mr. Chave advised that the HPC developed their proposal using the design standards recommended by urban design consultant Mark Hinshaw. He referred to the document titled "Design Standards for Building Design," which outlines the design standards that would be incorporated into the code requirements for the BD1 zone. He explained that the current design review process identifies design guidelines that must be considered. The proposed language would provide design standards that are mandatory for all development in the BD1 zone, and there would be very little variation in the process. The current threshold for design review is based on the SEPA threshold, which is fairly substantial. The proposed language would expand this threshold to include smaller projects. The HPC and ADB voiced concern that smaller projects could also have a significant impact on the streetscape. They discussed the option of requiring ADB design review for both small and large projects in the BD1 zone, but they cautioned against making the review too onerous.

Mr. Chave summarized that the proposed design review process for the BD1 zone would have potentially more standards and the ADB would be required to review more projects. However, both the ADB and the HPC agreed it would be appropriate to offer an alternative process for properties identified on a historic register or on the City's list of historic properties (BOLA Report). Properties in this category would be able to present their project proposals to the HPC for approval and avoid the ADB review process entirely. If the HPC finds the project to be in keeping with the historical character of the building, they could waive standards that would otherwise apply. This could potentially result in a more streamlined process.

Mr. Chave said another element of the proposed language is related to demolition permits. The HPC has requested a 60-day waiting period for demolition permits associated with properties in the BD1 zone. This would allow the HPC an opportunity to discuss other alternatives with the proponent. He emphasized that the HPC would not have the ability to prevent a property owner from obtaining a demolition permit and moving forward with a project, but it would allow an opportunity for them to explore other options before the demolition actually occurs. He said the Planning Board is particularly interested in the public's opinion regarding this issue.

Mr. Chave said the HPC is also very interested in providing incentives to encourage the preservation of historic properties in the BD1 zone. One incentive would be the ability to avoid the ADB design review process by going directly to the HPC for project approval. However, the HPC is also interested in other incentives that encourage people to restore and renovate historic buildings such as waiving permit fees, expediting permit approvals, etc. He noted these incentives were not identified as part of the proposed code amendments, but they would like the City Council to consider them.

**Bob Gregg** advised that he has served on design guideline committees and has witnessed the desired objectives of design guidelines fulfilled. He expressed his belief that the thoughtful creation and implementation of design standards is a perfectly appropriate role of the zoning authority. He referred to the overlay that was created for the Green Lake area, which is similar to what is currently being proposed for the BD1 zone. He noted that while there was opposition to the Green Lake overlay at first, they are now seeing large sites being redeveloped to standards set out by design guidelines, and the whole area is benefiting from this minimum standard of quality. Mr. Gregg said he supports the proposed code amendment, but he asked the Commission to consider the following changes:

- The last line of the italicized "purpose" paragraph should be deleted. He suggested the paragraph and purpose stand on their own without making two claims regarding property value and heritage tourism that may not be supportable by facts readily available. He urged the Board not to give an adversary an opportunity to challenge the design guidelines based on an avoidable argument about purpose.

- In the section titled “Threshold for Design Review,” the term “significant impact” is vague and needs to be defined or removed. He suggested that the design review requirement could be made universal so that all projects would require design review.
- The section titled “Applications for ADB Review,” would require applicants to provide all of the materials typically required for ADB review. He pointed out there is considerable misunderstanding as to what is typically required for ADB review. What is actually required is far less than most people think, and some of the requirements are probably too onerous for many small projects. He suggested it would be appropriate for the document to provide a separate list of the required materials.
- He suggested the proposed language found in the “Demolition” section might be illegal. He noted that most of the properties in the BD1 zone have a value of between \$1 and \$3 million dollars. Therefore, the carrying costs in the event of a new owner would be between \$30,000 and \$60,000 to comply with this as written. He said that while he appreciates the concern, they must find a more legal and reasonable way to deal with the issue.
- The creation of incentives is an excellent idea, and he offered to help identify areas that would be most helpful with the least negative impact on the City. He referred to his experience in redeveloping the Old Milltown site, which has yielded a treasure trove of lessons learned and areas of opportunity.
- He likes the three-story example that was provided in the “Massing and Articulation” section.
- He pointed out that Standard 2 in the “Ground Level Details” section is not always possible on Edmonds streets that sometimes slope both north/south and east/west on the same site. He suggested this standard needs more clarification.
- Standards 2 and 3 in the “Awnings/Canopies and Signage” section needs better definition or examples. He explained that the example of the encouraged structural awning is very close to the prohibited box awning. He suggested Standard 3 be revised to provide better reasoning and examples. He also pointed out that Standard 4 is not always possible due to street slope, and Standard 12 may conflict with the existing City standard, especially for monument signs that may become more prevalent with the new BD1 open space requirement.
- He suggested that the “Building Rooftop Equipment” section be revised to eliminate the screening requirement for rooftop equipment that cannot be seen from across the street.

Mr. Gregg summarized that the proposal has come a long ways, and he applauded the efforts of the HPC, the ADB and the Planning Board. He encouraged them to move the concept forward to the City Council as soon as possible.

**Al Rutledge** said he has attended public meetings for a number of years and has participated in efforts in the past to save historic buildings in Edmonds. He noted the guidelines have changed a lot over the years. He expressed concern about the proposed language that would require a 60-day delay for a demolition permit since this could result in a significant cost to the property owner and/or developer.

**City Council Member Bernheim** referred to Page 4 of the proposed document and expressed concern that a three-story building was provided as an example of massing. He pointed out that the City’s current height limit in the BD1 zone is 25 feet, so it is not likely a three-story building would be possible. He suggested the illustrations provided in the design standards only illustrate development that would be possible based on current City codes.

Next, City Council Member Bernheim referred to Page 5 of the draft document. He suggested that instead of using the term “buildings oriented to the adjacent street,” a more appropriate approach would be to consider a building’s orientation towards the sun. He suggested the proposed design standards take into consideration elements that address environmental issues. Otherwise, the design standards would result in a continuation of past ideas.

City Council Member Bernheim pointed out that Standard 2 on Page 6 would prohibit ground floor commercial spaces from having sunken entrances. He suggested the Board reconsider this standard to take into account the unique characteristics of the developable properties in the BD1 zone. He also urged the Board to discuss the intent of this standard in light of what the actual experience has been. He also referred to Standard 3 and pointed out that residential units would not be allowed on the ground floor along the street front. Therefore, there is really no need for a requirement that ground floor residential units be separated from the sidewalk.

Regarding the issue of rooftop equipment, City Council Member Bernheim agreed there is no need for artificial provisions for enclosing equipment that is not visible from the street. However, the language should include a requirement for

screening of equipment that is not on the rooftop. The language should protect adjacent properties from the noise and visual impact of this equipment, and it would be best to place the equipment inside buildings whenever possible.

**Chris Fleck** said he is a business owner of property in the BD1 zone and a resident of Edmonds. He expressed his belief that it would be inappropriate to rename the BD1 zone to something like the Downtown Heritage Center, etc. He suggested this could end up making it more difficult for property owners to make changes without people getting upset about changes to the historic center in Edmonds. The name change could result in another level of bureaucracy for the property owners to get through.

Mr. Fleck expressed opposition to the HPC's proposal that a member of their Commission participate on the ADB when properties in the BD1 zone are being considered. He emphasized that the ADB members were selected for their expertise in architectural design, and HPC members would not necessarily have these same skills other than the desire to protect something they think is important. Mr. Fleck agreed with Mr. Gregg that requiring a 60-day waiting period before issuing a building permit could result in a significant cost for the property owner and/or developer.

Mr. Fleck questioned how the City would determine which buildings in the BD1 zone have historic value that warrants preservation. He expressed his believe that there are few buildings in the BD1 zone that are worth saving, and there are no architectural masterpieces, either. He noted that Mr. Gregg has gone to great length and expense to save the façade of Old Milltown, but it was never an attractive building to start with.

Mr. Fleck said he likes the idea of providing incentives to property owners to make it easier to redevelop or remodel buildings in the BD1 zone, but he questioned the appropriateness of allowing the HPC to make decisions related to historic structures since they do not have skills or knowledge about buildings other than what they look like. He said he has never heard of the City's list of historic buildings in the downtown area (BOLA Report). He expressed concern that the proposed language could grant the HPC authority over property owners who want to make changes. He noted that the Planning Board's role is quasi-judicial and they make recommendations to the City Council. However, the HPC would have the ability and legal standing to approve or deny development proposals.

**Joan Longstaff** said she owns a historic home at 524 Main Street. She said she purchased the property 25 years ago, and she recognizes that her real estate office is not the highest and best use for the land. She said she has been involved on numerous committees associated with planning, and she is pleased that businesses are finally reaching the 500 block of Main Street. She said she has long been opposed to real estate and other offices being located on Main Street. The uses on Main Street should be limited to retail uses that are pedestrian friendly. She said she hopes to be able to move her home in the future; possibly to a property on 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, which has been designated as the City's Arts Corridor. The house would be an excellent structure for a restaurant or an art gallery, etc. Moving the house would open the property on Main Street for a pedestrian friendly retail use on the ground floor, with residential uses on the upper levels. She urged the City to create codes that encourage retail development and uses in the BD1 zone and encourage historic structures to relocate to properties along the Arts Corridor. She suggested the HPC could play an instrumental role in this effort.

**Steve Waite, Historic Preservation Commission**, said he was present to speak on behalf of the HPC in support of the proposed amendment. He announced that the HPC meets on the second Thursday of each month, and he encouraged the public to attend the meetings and participate in their work. He explained that while part of the HPC's purpose is to preserve historic structures, they recognize that many of the historic structures in Edmonds are not worth saving. He advised that the purpose of the proposed 60-day waiting period for demolition permits is to allow the HPC an opportunity to providing information and alternatives to property owners. However, the HPC recognizes they cannot stop a property owner from demolishing a structure.

Commissioner Waite advised that Edmonds was designated as a Certified Local Government in 2000 by the State of Washington, and criteria for nominating and placing properties on the Register was developed at that time. He emphasized that participation in the City's historic preservation program is strictly voluntary, and the HPC does not have the ability to place properties on the Edmonds Register of Historic Places without permission from the property owners. He advised that criteria was also adopted to guide the appointment of HPC members, and the group includes experts in the field of historic

preservation, engineering, architectural design, etc. The HPC must follow the criteria set forth by the State, and their members have experience in this specific field.

Commissioner Waite said he does not view the proposed language as another level of bureaucracy, and the HPC is excited about opportunities for property owners to increase the return on their investment in many cases by restoring a structure. However, he agreed that many buildings in the BD1 zone should be torn down and replaced.

Commissioner Waite advised that the HPC has members who are familiar with the process of relocating buildings, and they would be willing to help interested property owners in that regard. He clarified that property owners can place their properties on the Register at any time, and they can remove them at any time, as well. The program is strictly voluntary. He cautioned that historic value is not only related to age, but to the history behind the structure, as well.

Ms. Longstaff said she would be opposed to renaming the BD1 zone to infer a historic significance. She expressed her belief that there is no historic flavor in the downtown area.

Al Rutledge reminded the Board that the City also has the ability to purchase properties in the BD1 zone.

THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Mr. Chave suggested that because the Board has a number of other items on their agenda, they could defer their deliberation and recommendation to the February 27<sup>th</sup> meeting. The Board agreed to continue the public hearing to February 27<sup>th</sup>, for Planning Board deliberation and recommendation only. They invited Mr. Gregg to share his ideas related to possible incentives in writing for the Board to consider at their next meeting, as well. Mr. Gregg agreed to provide this information to staff prior to the Board's next meeting. Mr. Chave invited members of the audience to leave their names and addresses so staff could notify them of future dates when this topic would be discussed.

**PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING CITY OF EDMONDS STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (FILE NUMBER AMD-08-1)**

Mr. Fiene advised that the City was issued a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit on January 17, 2007, by the Washington State Department of Ecology (DOE). As part of this permit, the City was required to develop and implement a Stormwater Management Program (SWMP), and the document must be updated annually. The City must report their progress to the DOE on a yearly basis, and the deadlines to meet the requirements detailed in the permit are phased over a five-year period. He advised that he was present to provide an overview of the permit requirements and the City's Stormwater Management Program that was designed to meet the requirements.

Mr. Fiene advised that the permit requirements are divided into five major components. He reviewed the City's progress on each component as follows:

- **Public Education and Outreach:** Mr. Fiene said the public education and outreach program must target the general public, businesses, landscapers, engineers, contractors, developers and land use planners. The program must address issues such as impacts from impervious surfaces; best management practices for pet waste, auto repair and maintenance; pesticide and fertilizer use, and storage of hazardous materials; environmental stewardship actions; impacts of illicit discharges; low-impact development techniques; technical standards for stormwater site and erosion control plans; stormwater pond maintenance; and stormwater treatment and flow control. It is important that the program also emphasize that stormwater is not treated before it is released.

Mr. Fiene reported that the City has met all of the Public Education and Outreach requirements for 2008, and they have met many of the 2009 requirements, as well. He advised that needs have been met through programs sponsored by the Environmental Education Coordinator such as the Discovery Program and Watershed Fund Fair, classroom presentations, a storm drain stenciling program, and mailing out handouts regarding best management practices to selected businesses. He further advised that the City's 2008-2009 program would emphasize yard care techniques, low-

APPROVED

impact development techniques, detention pond maintenance, and new stormwater management requirements. It would target audiences that haven't been addressed yet via workshops, mailings, county programs, and the City's website.

- **Public Involvement and Participation in City's Stormwater Management Program:** Mr. Fiene advised that the City is required to provide an opportunity for public participation. This public hearing, as well as the public hearing scheduled before the City Council on February 19<sup>th</sup>, help the City meet this goal. In addition, information could be provided on the City's public television Channel 21 and in upcoming quarterly newsletters. The City would make the SWMP document and annual report available to the public by posting it on the City's website after it has been submitted to the Department of Ecology. The City would also consider the option of creating watershed committees and stewardship programs.
- **Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination:** Mr. Fiene advised that the City is required to develop a Municipal Storm Sewer Map by February 2011. The map must show the location of all known municipal storm outfalls, map drainage areas, and land uses. He reported that Edmonds has developed the maps, and staff would work to place all of the information on one map and create a GIS system.

Mr. Fiene said the City must also adopt an illicit discharge ordinance by August 2009, which prohibits non-stormwater and illegal discharges. The ordinance must include enforcement procedures and actions. Along with this plan, the City must also develop an enforcement strategy. He reported that the City adopted an Illegal Discharge Ordinance in 2004, and it includes enforcement procedures and actions. The City has also developed an enforcement strategy. They currently log all violations and corresponding actions taken. He concluded the City is fully compliant with this requirement.

Mr. Fiene advised that the City is required to have an ongoing discharge and detection program in place by August of 2011. This program must include procedures for locating priority areas likely to have illicit discharges. The City must visually inspect priority outfalls and develop procedures for characterizing the nature of and potential public or environmental threat posed by illicit discharges. The City must also implement procedures for tracing the source of an illicit discharge, as well as procedures for removing the source of the discharge. Mr. Fiene emphasized that in order to implement this requirement, it is likely that additional staff would be needed.

Mr. Fiene advised that the City's illicit discharge and detection program also includes a public information requirement. The City must distribute information to target audiences by August of 2011 and publicize a hotline for reporting illegal discharges by February 2009. He reported that the City has mailed out information on Best Management Practices and illegal discharges to various types of businesses. Prior to August 2011 the City would distribute appropriate information to all key audiences. In addition, the City would publicly list and publicize a hotline for reporting illegal discharges prior to February 2009. This would be a proactive approach to prevent illegal discharges from happening.

Mr. Fiene said the City is required to adopt and implement procedures for program evaluation and assessment. He reported that the City is already fully compliant in respect to the current reactive program, but they would need to readdress these policies once the more proactive program has been implemented.

Mr. Fiene said the City is required to provide appropriate training for field staff on identifying and reporting illegal discharges. He reported that staff is aware and knowledgeable regarding the issue, but more formal and informal training must be provided prior to the deadline.

- **Controlling Runoff from New Development, Redevelopment and Construction Sites:** Mr. Fiene advised that the City must adopt an ordinance and permitting process for controlling runoff for construction sites by August of 2009. The ordinance must include the new minimum requirements and technical thresholds listed in the appendix of the permit, as well as a site planning process and best management practice selection equivalent to the 2005 Ecology Manual. The ordinance must provide the City with the legal authority to inspect private storm facilities that drain into the City's system and provisions to allow low-impact development techniques. The ordinance should grant the City the authority to inspect development sites to verify proper installation and adopt an enforcement strategy. The ordinance must also ensure that a maintenance plan is in place for private storm facilities.

Mr. Fiene reported that the City already has an ordinance that allows them to inspect private facilities that are currently in place, but they need to update their Stormwater Ordinance and standards later this year. The City still needs to adopt the 2005 Ecology Manual as guidance for stormwater management design, and they must begin to require maintenance plans for new developments. The City must still adopt low-impact development regulations and standards, but they already have good inspection procedures that apply to all developments.

Mr. Fiene advised that the City must verify the adequate long-term operations and maintenance of private storm facilities by August of 2009. This requires the City adopt an ordinance that clearly identifies parties responsible for maintenance and requires inspection of facilities. In addition, the City must annually inspect all stormwater treatment and flow control facilities. He reported that the City already has an ordinance for long-term operations and maintenance, but new regulations would have to be adopted to meet the stricter standards. He said the City has inspected approximately 20% of the private stormwater facilities in 2007, but additional staffing would be required to perform annual inspections of all facilities.

- **Pollution Prevention and Operation and Maintenance for Municipal Operations:** Mr. Fiene reported that the City has already established maintenance standards, but they must still adopt the 2005 Ecology Manual and perform annual inspections and necessary maintenance of all stormwater facilities. Again, he advised that additional staff would be needed to accomplish this requirement. He said the City has already performed inspection of all catch basins and necessary maintenance for the citywide system. They have also implemented practices to reduce stormwater impacts associated with streets, parking lots, roads, highways and associated maintenance activities. He said the City has implemented policies to reduce pollutants in discharges from all lands owned or maintained by the City, and they plan to be fully compliant with the requirement by the deadline of February 2010. He reported that City employees have been trained regarding construction and operation and maintenance functions that impact stormwater quality, and the City has implemented an on-going training program that would enable them to be in full compliance prior to the deadline of August 2009. He emphasized that the City does not have a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan at this time for maintenance or storage yards and material storage facilities operated by the City. He said the City has plans to address this requirement by the February 2010 deadline.

Board Member Henderson asked if the Stormwater Management Program only covers stormwater, and not the release of untreated sewage from the City's Wastewater Treatment Plant. Mr. Fiene answered that the program only addresses stormwater requirements. He emphasized it is important for the public to understand that stormwater is not treated. Anything other than stormwater that gets into the stormwater system is considered illegal discharge. He advised that new developments often require stormwater treatment devices such as bioswales or separators, etc. Board Member Young suggested it is important for staff to make it clear to the public that stormwater is not treated before it is released into the streams, etc. Board Member Young inquired if the City has any combined wastewater and stormwater systems. Mr. Fiene answered that the City is working to eliminate all of these situations.

**Al Rutledge** suggested the City form citizen's committee throughout the City to address stormwater and other environmental issues and to educate the public. He noted this work could be done on a voluntary basis. He said the City is currently working with other jurisdictions to get a new stormwater system at Lake Ballinger, and this effort was spearheaded by a group of citizens in the Lake Ballinger area.

THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Mr. Fiene advised that no action is necessary from the Board at this time. The document would be presented to the City Council on February 19<sup>th</sup> for a final public hearing and potential approval.

#### **PRESENTATION BY ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER ON 2008-2014 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN (CIP)**

Mr. Fiene advised that the CIP is a long-range planning tool outlining the capital improvements planned for the next six years. The plan identifies funding sources and how and when the money would be spent. The comprehensive plans for the

**APPROVED**

various funds provide the framework for the capital projects. This work is an on-going process, and the updated document was compiled with input from the Parks and Recreation Department, Public Works Department, Community Services Department, Wastewater Treatment Plant Division, and the Administrative Services Department. He advised that the CIP provides a list of the various funds, a description of each project, as well as information related to funding sources. He said the project descriptions include costs estimates, and they are available for the public to access via the City's website. Mr. Fiene reviewed each of the funds as follows:

- **Fund 112 and 14 (REET 2)** – Mr. Fiene advised that these are the transportation funds that pay for transportation projects. The situation in this fund is much improved compared to two years ago. REET 2 funds over and above \$750,000 are now used for transportation projects. Last year, they received approximately \$600,000 from this source. He noted that a small portion of the motor vehicle fuel tax money was transferred to the transportation maintenance fund and the transportation maintenance fund lost money to the general fund to take care of other problems. He added that Olympic View Transfer Station dollars go to the general fund rather than the transportation capital fund to be used for street overlays to repair streets that were torn up for utilities. He noted that recent legislation authorized the City to create a transportation utility district, and the City Council has passed a resolution to explore this possibility.
- **Fund 113** – Mr. Fiene said this the multi-modal fund and is heavily dependent on outside funding. The City is no longer the lead on the project; it is now being pursued by Washington State Ferries. No local funds have been allocated for this project over the next six years.
- **Fund 116** – Mr. Fiene said this fund is for building maintenance projects. It is funded in 2007 and 2008 by the General Fund, with some grant funding. This account still has funding problems that are likely to continue.

Board Member Dewhirst asked if building maintenance projects are being deferred because of lack of funding. Mr. Miller answered that they are not quite to this point yet. They have completed a number of emergency projects that have allowed them to borrow against the emergency savings. However, the situation is more dire in 2009 and 2010. If they cannot get proper funding to implement the projects identified in the plan, the projects would have to be deferred. Board Member Young suggested this situation should be emphasized when the CIP is presented to the City Council for review and approval.

- **Fund 125** – Mr. Fiene advised that this is the parks, open space, recreation and beautification fund. Board Member Dewhirst noted that no grant funding is identified for the 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue Arts Corridor Program. Mr. Fiene noted these funds are identified in Fund 132, which is a separate fund for park grant projects. He noted that the City did receive a Preserve America Grant for the 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue Corridor. Mr. Fiene said staff has indicated their desire to have the dollars identified in one single account, but the administrative department wants a separate grant fund.
- **Fund 126** – Mr. Fiene said this is the parks acquisition fund. He said that while some members of the public have the impression there is a lot of money in the park acquisition fund, that is not really the case. He suggested the public confuses this fund with the park project fund. Fund 126 is for park acquisitions, but they must also use the money for debt service for projects such as the library roof, marina beach, purchase of the performing arts center, and seismic retrofit of the Anderson center. He summarized that this fund is heavily dependent on grant funding, and the cost of land in Edmonds is quite high.
- **Fund 129** – Mr. Fiene said this fund is for the special International District Project on Highway 99. The City's economic development director secured the grant funding for this project.
- **Fund 412-100** – Mr. Fiene advised that this is the water utility fund. Projects in this fund are identified in the 2002 Water Comprehensive Plan, which is currently being updated. He briefly reviewed some of the projects identified in this fund, including the replacement of 1% of the pipe each year. Board Member Young asked if this schedule is consistent with engineering standards. Mr. Fiene answered affirmatively and said some cities do not even have a replacement program. Mr. Young suggested this fact be emphasized when the CIP is presented to the City Council.

- **Fund 412-200** – Mr. Fiene said this is the stormwater utility fund. Projects included in this fund are identified in the 2003 Stormwater Comprehensive Plan. He reviewed some of the projects that have been completed, those that are in progress, and those that are planned.
- **Fund 412-300** – Mr. Fiene said this is the sanitary sewer utility fund, and projects in this fund are identified in the 2006 Sanitary Sewer Comprehensive Plan.
- **Fund 414** – Mr. Fiene said this is the wastewater treatment plant fund. He briefly reviewed the projects identified in this fund.

In overall summary, Mr. Fiene said the transportation funds are in much better condition. However, Fund 116 is heavily reliant on grants to meet projected needs. Other funds appear to be meeting needs. He noted that the current situation in Fund 126 and said the cost of acquiring property in the City of Edmonds makes it difficult for the City to do as much as people want them to.

Board Member Young referred to Fund 116, which is the Building Maintenance Fund. He suggested that when the CIP is presented to the Board for public hearing they should make it clear to the public how much the City depends on grant funding for building maintenance projects. This is a clear indication that the City has insufficient funds to take care of their current facilities without this grant funding. He invited the staff to provide a prognosis on how successful the City would be in securing grant funding for this fund in the future. He summarized that the situation of this fund needs to be clearly emphasized to the City Council, as well. It is important to paint a clear picture of where the maintenance money comes from. He suggested the City's goal should be to take care of preventative maintenance projects without grant funds. He expressed his belief that the future of grant funding does not look good, and staff should identify those projects that would likely have to be deferred. The City Council needs this information in order to make an informed policy decision to address the Fund 116 problems. He complimented staff for doing a great job with the resources available to them, but suggested they need to make the situation clear to the City Council.

Board Member Henderson questioned why the citywide fiber optic project was not identified in any of the funds. He said it was his understanding that the City would study the feasibility of this project in 2008. Mr. Fiene said this project has not been brought to his attention, and he agreed to pursue more information.

Mr. Fiene advised that the CIP would be presented to the Board for a public hearing and a recommendation to the City Council on March 12, 2008. A hearing has been scheduled before the City Council on March 18<sup>th</sup>.

THE BOARD TOOK A 10-MINUTE BREAK AT 9:20 P.M. THEY RECONVENED THE MEETING AT 9:30 P.M.

**PRESENTATION ON PARKS, RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE COMPREHENSIVE AND CULTURAL PLANS (FILE NUMBER AMD-07-7)**

Mr. McIntosh said he was present to review the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Comprehensive Plan and the Community Cultural Program in preparation for a public hearing before the Board on February 27<sup>th</sup>. He invited the Board Members to email their comments related to the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Comprehensive Plan to him as soon as possible. Comments related to the Community Cultural Program should be emailed to Frances White Chapin. He emphasized that the documents are still in draft form.

Mr. McIntosh advised that two community advisory groups have been working on the documents since March of 2007. Two community open houses were conducted, as well as an electronic and a scientific survey. The document also incorporates feedback provided by the Board in November. He advised that the proposed plans set forth the park and cultural plans for the next 25 years. He referred to the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Comprehensive Plan, which includes broad goals and objects. He emphasized that it is not a blue print but a guide for budgeting future capital improvements. He briefly reviewed the document and highlighted the following:

- **Table of Contents** – Mr. McIntosh said the table of contents identifies the main chapters of the plan. He emphasized that the 2006 Walkway Plan was inadvertently omitted from the appendix section, but it would be added before the document is presented for public hearing.
- **Executive Summary** – Mr. McIntosh encouraged the Board Members to carefully read the executive summary, since it provides a good outline of what is contained in the document.
- **Mission Statement** – Mr. McIntosh referred to the Parks Department’s Mission Statement, which makes it clear they are very aware of the economic and health benefits associated with the services they provide to the citizens of Edmonds. In addition, they are very concerned about the health, welfare and quality of life of the citizens.
- **Vision and Priorities** – Mr. McIntosh referred to Page i, which lists from the priorities that were developed for the Edmonds park system. These priorities were identified by the advisory group and staff. He reviewed the priorities as follows:
  - To Improve Connectivity
    - Partner with schools for neighborhood park sites and park diversity.
    - Provide connections to the waterfront and downtown.
    - Create a multi-modal city by improving the walking and biking trail system.
  - To Provide Diverse Activities
    - Create new neighborhood and community parks to provide an even distribution of recreation elements in all parts of Edmonds.
    - Protect and connect the natural resources.
    - Provide a flexible design to respond to new activities and diverse environments.
  - To Provide Diverse Activities
    - Improve the website and marketing materials for existing and new park elements.
    - Ensure the value of the park system for the economic health of Edmonds and the physical well being of its citizens, which is recognized throughout the city planning process.
- **Major Recreation Programs** – Mr. McIntosh referred to Table 3.4 on Page 3-11 of the document, which outlines the various types of major recreation programs the City offers. The chart also indicates the percentage of revenue provided by each one, as well as the number of yearly participants.
- **Revenue and Fee Analysis** – Mr. McIntosh referred to Table 3.5 on Page 3-16, which provides a revenue and fees analysis for the Parks Department. He noted it costs nearly \$3 million to operate the department each year, and recreation services brings in approximately \$1.1 in funding. The net cost per capita is \$46.49, which is still on the lower end when compared to other cities. For example, the City of Seattle spends approximately \$169 per capita on parks, making them second in the nation and an extremely livable city.
- **Community Needs Assessment** – Mr. McIntosh advised that Chapter 4 outlines the process that was used for identifying park needs within the City. It also provides an evaluation of the existing park services. He noted that the “connections” section is a new item in the plan. He encouraged the Board Members to read this section carefully since it identifies future park needs as identified by the Community Advisory Group and staff. The needs assessment took into account public comments received from the open house, as well as comments obtained from the two surveys.
- **Goals and Objectives** – Mr. McIntosh referred to Chapter 5, which outlines the goals and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan. He noted that the goals describe services the City wishes to provide, and the objectives provide more specific information about how they intend to achieve the goals.
- **Action Plan** – Mr. McIntosh advised that Chapter 6 contains the action plan for implementing the goals and objectives identified in Chapter 5. It provides an action plan for improving the neighborhood park system, the community park

system, the regional park system, special use areas, the open space system, connections, and recreational facilities. It specifically calls out field improvements at Seaview Park and Westgate Elementary School, as well as major improvements at the Civic Center Playfields and Skate Park. The City would like to eventually acquire this property, but until this occurs, they are limited as to the upgrades they can do on the site. He pointed out that the fishing pier, a regional facility, is now 32 years old and is showing its age as a result of the harsh marine environment. While the City does not own the fishing pier, they have agreed to maintain everything above the pier. A number of projects have been proposed for this site. Mr. McIntosh advised that the plan calls for complete renovation of the Dayton Street Plaza. Seismic upgrades are currently underway at the Frances Anderson Cultural Center, as well. He added that Yost Pool is at the point where something major needs to be done. The plan calls for a feasibility study in 2008, and alternatives would be examined to determine costs and various options related to this site or alternate sites.

- **Funding Plan** – Mr. McIntosh said Chapter 7 identifies possible funding options for projects. He explained that the City has been fortunate to receive substantial amounts of money from Snohomish County and from the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (RCO) (formerly IAC). Staff will submit an application to the RCO this summer requesting 450,000 in matching funds for the Interurban Trail. If approved, this funding would allow the City to begin construction of their portion of the trail by September of 2009.

Mr. McIntosh referred the Board to three maps that were provided for their information. The first map identifies the existing condition of the current parks. The second map identifies the recommended plan for neighborhood parks and specifically identifies areas where there are deficits. He cautioned that just because a deficit is identified for a certain area does not mean the area is not adequately served by some other type of park such as a regional park or a community park. In addition, school facilities offer recreational opportunities to neighborhoods. Mr. McIntosh said the third map identifies proposed connections. He noted that numerous projects are currently taking place to help the City accomplish their goal of providing more connection between the various recreational facilities. He briefly reviewed the connection projects that are currently taking place, as well as those that are being planned for.

Mr. McIntosh invited the Board Members to review the documents and forward their comments to staff as soon as possible. He noted that there would be two public hearings before the documents are eventually adopted by the City Council: one before the Planning Board and another before the City Council. He said he anticipates a lot of feedback from the public when the documents are presented to the public for a hearing at the Board's February 27<sup>th</sup> meeting.

### **REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA**

Chair Guenther reminded the Board that in addition to the items identified on the extended agenda, the February 27<sup>th</sup> agenda would include a continued public hearing on the Downtown BD1 zone, but for Board deliberation only.

### **PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS**

Chair Guenther advised that he forwarded to each Board Member via email an 85-page study commissioned by the American Institute of Architects titled "*Local Leaders in Sustainability: A Study of Green Building Programs in Our Nation's Communities.*" He said the study looked at communities greater than 50,000 in population and reviewed what programs they have in place and how they implemented zoning codes to become more green and sustainable communities. He suggested the Board discuss this study at their upcoming retreat. He noted there are currently three cities in the state with green codes in place: Seattle, Bellingham, and Shoreline. He suggested they use these jurisdictions as a resource when considering codes for Edmonds.

### **PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS**

None of the Board Members provided comments during this portion of the meeting.

**APPROVED**

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:02 p.m.

**APPROVED**