

APPROVED DECEMBER 9TH

CITY OF EDMONDS MINUTES OF SPECIAL PLANNING BOARD MEETING

November 4, 2009

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

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Philip Lovell, Vice Chair
Cary Guenther
Jim Young
Judith Works
Valerie Stewart
Kevin Clarke

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT

Michael Bowman, Chair (excused)
John Reed (excused)

STAFF PRESENT

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager
Stephen Clifton, Community Services/Economic Development Director
Noel Miller, Public Works Director
Jerry Shuster, Stormwater Manager
Brian McIntosh, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director
Rob English, City Engineer
Bertrand Hauss, Transportation Engineer
Frances Chapin, Cultural Services Manager
Karin Noyes, Recorder

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER WORKS MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 14, 2009 BE APPROVED AS AMENDED. BOARD MEMBER GUENTHER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

No changes were made to the agenda.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS

There was no one in the audience who expressed a desire to address the Board during this portion of the meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING ON CAPITAL FACILITIES UPDATE FOR 2009-2015 TO CITY'S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Noel Miller advised that this is a public hearing on the Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) element update for 2009 – 2015. The proposal updates the City's CFP to include improvements, additions, upgrades and/or extensions of City infrastructure such as transportation, parks, stormwater, sewer and water systems along with other public facilities necessary to implement the City's Comprehensive Plan. It incorporates projects from the recently updated Transportation and Parks Plan elements. He explained that the CFP is updated annually and identifies capital projects for at least the next six years. He noted that this year's CFP will focus only on capital improvement projects and will not include projects that involve the preservation and replacement of existing City infrastructure. Maintenance projects will remain in the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), which is a separate document. He advised that the CFP is organized into three general areas:

- Transportation Projects: The Transportation Plan was just recently reviewed by the Planning Board and adopted by the City Council.

- Stormwater Projects: The Stormwater Plan is currently being revised to comply with the NPDES Phase II Clean Water Act requirements. The Drinking Water Plan is currently being revised to comply with the most current Department of Health regulations. Both of these plans will be presented to the Board for review during the first quarter of 2010. The Sanitary Sewer Plan was updated in 2006 and the City is currently conducting a study to address inflow and infiltration concerns.
- Parks, General and Regional Projects. The Comprehensive Parks Plan was reviewed by the Board and adopted by the City Council in December of 2008.

Mr. Miller stated that the Washington State Ferries (WSF) Final Long-Range Plan indicates that the Edmonds terminal would remain in its current location at least through 2030. Only one improvement project is scheduled to be completed at the Edmonds terminal in the 2029-2031 biennium, which would total \$26 million. That means the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) has not identified any additional funding for the Edmonds Crossing Project. Other significant projects identified in the plan include: 4th Avenue Cultural Corridor, aquatics center, arts center, Boys and Girls Club building, expansion of street lighting, expansion of Edmonds Library, additional play fields at Woodway High School site, and Senior Center building replacement.

Mr. Miller said that in addition to the numerous staff members who were present to answer questions of the Board, members of the Citizens Advisory Committee for Transportation have requested time to present their endorsement to adequately fund transportation projects.

Vice Chair Lovell questioned why the CFP identifies funding in the future for the Edmonds Crossing Project when nothing will happen until at least 2030. Mr. Clifton recalled that at the last meeting he reported that WSF and the City are examining minimum build alternatives for the Edmonds Crossing Project, and consultants are still looking at alternatives to the preferred alternative. The funds identified in the plan are considered pass through dollars, and not expenses incurred by the City. They were included in the plan for budget purposes to show what the expenditures are estimated to be through 2015. He emphasized the numbers are estimates and depend on the level of work needed for WSF to examine the minimum build alternatives. He summarized that while it is possible something could happen with the project before 2030, it would not be the preferred alternative known as the Point Wells version. The project would likely be a significantly scaled back version.

Vice Chair Lovell observed that at some point in the not to distant future, the City will likely undertake a study regarding redevelopment of the waterfront. At this point in time, it is fair to say that the combination of projects by WSDOT, WFS and Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) will have a tremendous impact on what can and cannot be done on these properties. At some point, the City will have to make the decision to proceed with growth and development rather than waiting for the State to do something with the ferry terminal. Mr. Clifton advised that he has been working with Jeff Doyle, Director of Public/Private Partnerships, WSF, regarding the properties between James and Main Streets. Because WSF owns the parking lot south of the old Skippers property, they believe it makes sense to include the Skippers property as part of a public/private partnership for redevelopment. He agreed that at some point, the City will have to make some decisions as to how they will move forward with redevelopment of the downtown/waterfront properties.

Board Member Works noted that the CFP does not include projects to maintain a good connection between the downtown and waterfront properties. She emphasized that the problem will only become worse when BNSF has installed their second track and the number of trains increases from 40 to 104 per day. Mr. Clifton explained that the City is always looking for opportunities to provide some type of overpass over the railroad tracks to improve pedestrian connectivity between the waterfront and downtown, and they are continually looking for funding sources. Board Member Works noted that not only will the City need to improve pedestrian access of the tracks, but cars will need to have safe access to the waterfront, as well. Mr. Clifton explained that because the City lacks funding to provide an overpass, they must rely on some type of assistance from the State. They are working with WSF and WSDOT to address this issue. Board Member Clarke questioned how the project could become a priority item to study and fund. Mr. Clifton recalled that part of the Sound Transit Edmonds Commuter Rail Station Improvements will improve the existing crossing on Dayton Street by adding double gates and smoothing out the surface. However, for the time being, Dayton Street will remain the only location where vehicles can cross over the railroad tracks.

Board Member Clarke inquired about the possibility of constructing a crossing under the tracks. Mr. Clifton answered that this approach would be an expensive endeavor given the water table is only five feet deep. In addition, the existing grade would require a much longer pier into the Sound. He concluded that this option has been discussed, but it would be physically and technically difficult to implement. Board Member Clarke observed that the only other alternative would be to go over the tracks, and it is not likely this option would garner community support due to the associated visual and physical impacts.

Mr. Clifton reminded the Board that the preferred alternative for the Edmonds Crossing Project would have moved the terminal to Point Edwards, which would have allowed access from Pine Street across the tracks. The grade would then descend to the terminus at 3%. Most of the ferry traffic would have been removed from the downtown. There are also environmental impacts and benefits associated with relocation to the Point Edwards site. Board Member Clarke expressed concern about the impact 104 trains per day will have on businesses on the waterfront. Their access problems will significantly increase once the double track has been installed. Mr. Clifton agreed it will be a lot more challenging to cross the tracks when the second track is added.

Board Member Stewart referred to the list of building maintenance projects and specifically requested more information about the energy efficiency improvements. Mr. Miller answered that the City is working on a program using the State of Washington Energy Contracting Process to review and identify energy efficiency projects where the cost would be equivalent to the energy savings over time. They have just completed the second phase of the program. Board Member Stewart said she wished the City had money set aside for these projects. The City is trying to have more sustainable buildings, and that applies to new buildings, as well. She encouraged City staff to demonstrate sustainable building in each of their projects, and Mr. Miller indicated that is staff's goal.

Board Member Stewart requested additional information about the skate park expenditure. Mr. McIntosh answered that the City has not selected the location for a second skate park, but money was identified because staff felt a second park would be warranted. He explained a skate park element would be considered anytime a new park area is developed. Board Member Stewart noted that the current skate park is well used and she thinks it is a good idea to consider another one.

Board Member Stewart noted that \$2,500 has been identified for the underwater park. She noted that visitors come to the park from all over the country, and she suggested the City consider charging a fee to use the park. Mr. McIntosh pointed out that, at this time, all City parks are open to the public free of charge. He noted the underwater park is considered a special use park, as is the fishing pier. He explained that the City does not own the fishing pier property. It is located above property that is owned by the Port of Edmonds. The Department of Fish and Wildlife owns the pier and the City has a maintenance agreement with them to maintain the facility. Again, Board Member Stewart urged staff not to exclude the possibility of charging for the underwater park because it requires a lot of maintenance and risk and offers a highly-sought-after activity. People would likely be willing to pay for its use. Mr. McIntosh observed that if the City were to charge for the use of the underwater park, they would also be expected to invest money into its maintenance. He noted the City provides very little financial support for the park; it is totally volunteer driven and has cost the City next to nothing over the past 25 years.

Board Member Clarke questioned if there is some way to increase opportunities for the public to make voluntary contributions into their favorite park fund. It is important to make the public aware that revenue is needed to support the facilities, and there may be individuals who want to contribute in various forms. Mr. McIntosh said the City currently has three trust funds that support Yost Pool, the flower program, and environmental programs. He said he has been discussing the issue with Board Member Stewart, who provided examples of how to make it easier for people to give to something that is near and dear to their heart. Staff is looking into a program that would make it easier for people to donate funding to support their favorite park facilities.

Board Member Clarke requested more information about the potential acquisition of the Civic Center Playfield. Mr. McIntosh explained that, at this time, the City has a 40-year lease with the Edmonds School District at a nominal cost, which expires in 2021. At that time, it will be up to the school district to decide what they want to do with the property. If they decide to surplus, the City would be very interested in its acquisition. Staff plans to have discussions with the school district well in advance of the lease expiration. Board Member Clarke suggested the City should start budgeting for the acquisition

APPROVED

now so that funding is available when the lease expires. Mr. McIntosh explained that funds in the 126 Fund (park acquisition) have been tapped out on the projects such as City Hall, which will be paid off in 2015. At that time, it would be prudent for the City to consider putting money together to purchase the Civic Center Playfield.

Vice Chair Lovell inquired if the same principle would apply relative to the proposed development of more play areas and park space at the old Woodway High School site. Mr. McIntosh explained that this is different situation. The school district purchased the Old Woodway High School and Madronna Elementary School sites from the Department of Natural Resources (DNR), and the underlying deed restricts the school district from doing anything with the property other than recreational and education uses into perpetuity. Board Member Clarke noted that a portion of the Woodway High School site is zoned for open space. When they review the Comprehensive Plan in 2011, perhaps the Board should consider a rezone for the Madronna Elementary site so it does not have a residential zoning designation. Mr. McIntosh explained that, given the deed restriction, residential uses on the two sites would not be possible. Board Member Clarke indicated that the school district could let the property go back to the DNR, and the DNR could sell it for residential uses.

Don Fiene, Citizens Advisory Committee for Transportation, noted the wide range of public services the Transportation Plan provides to all citizens on a daily basis. The plan identifies projects that include roadway improvements, overlays, signaled intersection improvements, road stabilization projects, bikeway and walkway projects, traffic calming programs, etc. The new Transportation Plan was developed with a great amount of public input from three citizen committees: the Citizens Advisory Committee for Transportation, the Walkway Committee, and the Edmonds Bicycle Advocacy Group.

Mr. Fiene said the Citizens Advisory Committee for Transportation is concerned that the proposed CFP and CIP fall well short of providing adequate funding to implement the Transportation Plan recommendations. He referred to a spreadsheet, which identifies anticipated revenues and expenditures. It assumes there will be more Transportation Benefit District (TBD) money for capital projects in the latter years. However, it is important to note that TBD funding presently goes towards operations and maintenance and additional TBD funding has not been secured and must be approved by a public vote. He also pointed out that the stimulus money the City received in 2009 was a one-time deal that funded several overlay projects. He provided pictures to illustrate the advisory committee's following concerns:

- Meadowdale Beach Road is not even identified on the 6-year plan, even though there is no sidewalk linking the street with the elementary and middle schools in the area. There is also no link to the newly constructed Meadowdale Walkway, which is a City of Lynnwood project.
- Both 80th and 88th Avenues are mentioned in 2016, but only if there is sufficient TBD and grant funding. Right now there is no where to walk on either street, even though they provide access to Seaview, Sierra and Southwest County Parks.
- Madronna Elementary is identified for funding if there is sufficient TBD and grant funding. Right now there are no sidewalks for children to walk to school. While walkway projects leading to schools rank high on grant applications, the City must have matching funds available before they can accept grant funding.
- The current CIP identifies a 48-year overlay cycle, and the optimal cycle would be 20 years for arterial and 30 years for residential streets. This funding also assumes there will be additional TBD funds. Without citizen approval for a \$60 per vehicle TBD tax, the overlay program would be on an 80-year cycle. The amount of overlay done in 2009 with stimulus funds is equal to what would be required each year to maintain a 30-year cycle.
- No road stabilization projects are identified in the 6-year plan, and there is no contingency fund to address emergency situations, either.
- Obesity is an epidemic in America, and walking is the number one preferred recreational opportunity for Edmonds Residents as pointed out in a survey that was completed as part of the Comprehensive Parks Plan. Walking is what people want to do, but in many cases, they cannot do so safely. Kids cannot walk to school in some cases, and they should have this ability.
- Meadowdale Beach Road needs an overlay. It is a collector street with huge ruts. If streets are allowed to remain in disrepair, they will have to be rebuilt at a cost that is 3 times greater than a simple overlay. Both 80th and 88th Avenues have the same problem, as does Olympic View Drive, and 176th Street.
- The Five Corners intersection has a lot of problems and many ideas for resolution, but lack of funding has pushed this project way out. The 228th Street corridor improvements should be funded in the 6-year plan, as well. In addition, there

are numerous accidents at the intersection of 76th Avenue and Highway 99, yet the project has not been funded in the proposal. While this would be a costly project, it could save lives.

Mr. Fiene pointed out that the Comprehensive Transportation Plan outlines the current funding problems in detail. The current funding includes several sources, but not a lot of money. Grants are identified as a potential revenue source, but it is important to keep in mind that the City must provide matching local funds. The motor vehicle tax only generates only a small amount right now, and traffic mitigation fees will not provide significant funding because the City is nearly built out. Transfers from other funds such as the utility fund are also coming in. It is important to note that joint agency funding also requires a local match. Because the first \$750,000 of real estate excise tax goes to fund parks, the transportation fund has not received any of these monies for a few years. Development in-lieu-of fees are required for the sidewalk fund, but it does not equate to a lot. The end result is a huge funding short fall for transportation projects.

Mr. Fiene cautioned that delayed maintenance and improvements result in emergency projects in the future at a much higher cost. Failure to maintain roadways can result in accidents and greater liability for the City. It also results in an unattractive City at a time when they are interested in encouraging and supporting economic development. Poor funding also makes it difficult to accomplish projects on short notice; and if they don't have matching funds, they cannot obtain grant funding, either. He emphasized that now is a good time to go out to bid because construction costs are low, but if the City doesn't have money they cannot take advantage of this opportunity.

Mr. Fiene said the Citizens Advisory Committee for Transportation urges the City to use a transparent process for updating their CIP and CFP. They need to carefully explore all the possibilities and make wise decisions based on the pros and cons, and the advisory committee would like to have a role in the process. The Planning Board played a significant role in helping staff push forward and get additional funding the last time the CIP was updated. He said the advisory committee recommends the City prioritize the development of a solid funding plan for the transportation system. The work should begin immediately and should include the option of increasing the TBD fee. If the City cannot secure additional TBD funding, they need to research other possibilities, as well. For example, Olympic View franchise fees should be going to transportation rather than the general fund. They tear up the City's roads, and the franchise fees should be used to repair these situations.

Vice Chair Lovell recalled that when the Board recommended approval of the Comprehensive Transportation Plan, they included a recommendation that the City Council pursue the option of increasing the TBD fee. He inquired regarding the status of this recommendation. Mr. Miller answered that the City Council did create the Transportation Benefit District, and they had the ability to raise the fee up to \$20 without voter approval, which they did. They also chose to use the fees collected for operations and maintenance and not capital projects. However, the City Council only has the ability to enact a \$20 fee. Any higher fee would require voter approval.

Board Member Clarke pointed out that because the TBD money is currently used for maintenance and operations, it does not provide funding to implement the Transportation Plan. He questioned how the Planning Board could encourage the City Council to dedicate funds for specific transportation projects. Mr. Fiene suggested the Board make a recommendation to the City Council regarding funding. He explained that as the City's budget problems have unfolded over the past few years, the general fund, the gas tax revenue and the TBD revenues has gone somewhere else besides transportation projects, which is unfortunate. He expressed his belief that transportation funding should be one of the City's highest priorities because everyone receives benefits and even emergency services depend on a good transportation system. If they don't work to get a funding program in place for transportation, the City will end up spending more later to rebuild the roadways.

Board Member Clarke questioned if the general public even understands that transportation funds were transferred for other uses. Mr. Fiene agreed. He noted that similar problems exist in other cities, as well, but Edmonds has a much larger problem than most. For example, three years ago Mountlake Terrace was spending three times as much on roads as Edmonds. Every city he researched was doing better than Edmonds. Edmonds has not addressed their transportation issues as well as other cities have done.

Board Member Stewart announced that there is current legislation in the Federal Government called the Cities and Schools Act of 2009, which also involves the Director for the Center of Disease Control and Prevention. The goal of the legislation

APPROVED

is to look at programs to reduce obesity in and around schools. Matching grant funding would be available to local and state governments for this purpose. She agreed to research the legislation to learn more about how to obtain the grant funding. She suggested the obesity argument is effective in pointing out the need for improved walkways and bicycle paths. There are poor walkways connecting many neighborhoods to schools, and studies show that kids are getting heavier. It is definitely something that must be addressed.

Mr. Clifton clarified that the City Council serves as the TBD Board. They enacted a \$20 TBD fee and chose to apply the funds strictly to street operations and maintenance for paving, sealing, crosswalks, signage, etc. Therefore, the funding from the TBD fee is used only for transportation purposes. He explained that the general fund subsidized street operations by \$400,000 in 2008, \$700,000 in 2009 and \$720,000 in 2010. The TBD was established in part to help offset the need to subsidize the transportation program via the general fund. However, that does not mean the general fund revenue was available to begin with.

Laura Spehar, Edmonds, advised that she is the team leader for the Edmonds Backyard Wildlife Habitat Project and is a member of the group, Friends of the Edmonds Marsh. She advised that the group has been meeting regularly for more than a year, and they have already started some clean up and restoration projects at the marsh. As the Board is currently reviewing the Capital Facilities Plan, the group believes that now is a good time to secure the future of the Edmonds Marsh. She said the group's hope is that the Board and community will come to understand the benefits the marsh provides.

Barbara Tipton, Edmonds, advised that the Friends of the Edmonds Marsh has adopted the following mission statement: "To expand and restore and protect the marine wildlife habitat by engaging the community to preserve, steward and enjoy our most natural asset." Their vision statement is as follows: "Healthy functions, pocket estuaries, and free connections to Puget Sound that provide habitat for diversity of native plants, fish and wildlife and maintaining the marsh as a recreational asset for the Edmonds community."

Keeley O'Connell, Edmonds, said she is also a member of the recently formed Friends of the Edmonds Marsh. She advised that she is a restoration ecologist with People for Puget Sound. In addition to being an Edmonds resident who enjoys the marsh, she has a clear understanding and concern about the amount of habitat that has been lost within the Puget Sound Region. She provided a habitat overlay that was done as part of a report prepared by People for Puget Sound. The report looked at some of the historical habitat loss at the Edmonds Marsh. She agreed to forward a copy of the report for staff to distribute to the Board Members. She said the goal of the group is to make the report available to members of the community and to identify the primary stakeholders. The group will make contact with these individuals in an attempt to expand awareness of the Edmonds Marsh. They also want to engage in a feasibility study about reconnecting the Edmond Marsh to Puget Sound by daylighting Willow Creek, which has been identified in several different City plans, including Edmonds Crossing. She advised that some initial work has already been done as part of the Environmental Impact Statement for the Edmonds Crossing Project. Friends of Edmonds Marsh would like to engage the process and move forward by securing funding to initiate a feasibility study to build upon the work already done.

Ms. O'Connell said she is not sure if this hearing is the right time to request that funding be identified in the Capital Facilities Program, but they want to bring ideas forward as a newly formed group in Edmonds that is trying to move an initiative forward. She advised that the group could provide the City with an electronic version of their mission and vision statements.

Board Member Stewart stressed the need to understand the economic importance of the marsh. She noted that the City's Comprehensive Plan specifically states that the City's marshes and other areas contain natural vegetation, which is an important resource that should be preserved. They represent unique habitat for marine organisms and the marine estuary environment. She advised that she was a park ranger last year and a volunteer naturalist at Discovery Park for nine years, and she has seen species diminish in many areas, including the Edmonds Marsh. It is time for the City to address the issue and make sure that when any plan is moved forward, priority is given to preserving the marsh and what it does for the environment. Ms. O'Connell said the group is very thankful that protection of the marsh already exists in the City's Comprehensive Plan, and they look forward to engaging the community more to raise awareness of the marsh. In the future, it would be great to have pedestrian access over the railroad tracks to provide a connection between the marsh and Marina Beach Park.

APPROVED

Jerry Shuster noted that the proposed CFP identifies two projects related to the marsh; a Willow Creek Project as well as a marsh restoration project. He said he has read the report that was prepared by People for Puget Sound, and a lot of the information in the proposed document, including estimated costs, came directly from the report. It is also important to keep in mind that the BNSF Project includes a bridge trestle over the tracks to accommodate the future daylighting of Willow Creek.

John Houghton, Edmonds, said he is a member of Friends of the Edmonds Marsh. He is also a professional marine biologist and has done a project for the Port of Edmonds related to the Edmonds Marsh and the feasibility of daylighting Willow Creek. He has also worked with Mr. McIntosh and the Deer Creek Hatchery to address issues related to the marsh. In addition, he worked with Reid Middleton to prepare the City's current Shoreline Master Program Update. He expressed his opinion that the City currently has fantastic opportunities for restoring the marsh. There is great potential for the type of habitat that is critical to the survival of juvenile salmon, and there is a lot of incentive in the Shoreline Master Program for this kind of action.

Board Member Stewart asked if the group has made any progress towards obtaining grant funding for the restoration project. Mr. Houghton answered that they are struggling as to how to go about the grant process. He explained that the Snohomish County Resource Committee is very interested in projects that restore pocket estuaries, and the group's intent is to communicate with this group to figure out a way to leverage monies from whatever sources possible in order to make the project happen. He noted that WSDOT removed the pier as part of their advance mitigation plan, and the group has raised the possibility that perhaps they may be interested in daylighting Willow Creek, as well.

Hank Landau, Edmonds, Co-Chair of the Edmonds Bicycle Advocacy Group and a Member of the Mayors Climate Protection Committee, advised that the bicycle advocacy group has been in existence for 17 years. Until the past few years, they have worked primarily with Edmonds, but their role has broadened as a result of heightened interest from surrounding communities to promote bicycle improvements. He said he was present to speak in support of the pedestrian and bicycle component of the CFP. He noted that very few dollars are devoted to bicycle projects (less than 1/10 of a percent), but there are also improvements tied with other roadway projects that are important in promoting convenience and safety for bicyclists. He said the group particularly appreciated the City staff's support in getting a signal light installed as part of the Interurban Trail Project.

Mr. Landau said the advocacy group has seen a much greater interest from the Edmonds School District in promoting bicycling. They have requested that the group, in association with the Cascade Bicycle Club, provide instruction to students on safe bicycle riding. A program was started last year and continues to date. The program is intended to help address the issue of children's health and obesity, and it has been proven that physical activity promotes learning. In addition, the district has indicated they will reduce bus service, and they are looking for opportunities to offer children the ability to ride their bicycles to school. Mr. Landau recommended the City consider making greater bicycle improvements than currently identified in the proposed CFP. This is especially important for children. It would also be desirable to work with surrounding communities to provide links that would bring more people to Edmonds.

Board Member Stewart thanked Mr. Landau for being so proactive in trying to enable bicycling in the City in a safe manner and for encouraging bicycling as a mode of transportation. She suggested the advocacy group contact Dan Burden, who is a nationally recognized authority on bicycle and pedestrian facilities and programs. He has a non-profit organization called Project for Public Spaces and has done some work in Seattle. She recommended the group seek out his research and perhaps invite him to the area. Mr. Landau noted that the advocacy group is affiliated with the Bicycle Alliance, and they have arranged for the Chair of the Alliance to speak to the group in January about initiatives for bicycling in the state.

Mr. Fiene referred to the stormwater portion of the CFP and said he worked for the City for 16.5 years, first as a hydraulics engineer. When he first came to the City, he received numerous telephone calls from property owners every time it rained hard. The City created a program for constructing an average of one mile of pipe per year to address the issue. It is important to keep on top of the stormwater issue. He recalled the City conducted a rate study recently, but it appears they are reluctant to move it forward and implement higher rates. He urged the Board to recommend the City Council take action as per the study as soon as possible. He advised that as a private consultant, he worked with the City of Edmonds on issues

related to 93rd and 95th Avenues. The project is designed and ready to go to bid, but it is currently sitting on the shelf because of lack of funding. They need to get this project out to bid. Stormwater projects should be a priority, and implementing a rate increase as identified in the rate study would be the appropriate thing to do. He noted that in the past 18 years, the City's utility rates have not increased more than inflation. If this is made clear to the citizens, they should be satisfied with a rate increase. He suggested the City's utility rates are low when compared to other cities. He emphasized that utilities are used by all citizens every day, and they should be a priority in the CFP. If the City does not invest adequate money for maintenance and replacement now, they will be faced with a much costlier situation in the future. The water and sewer programs are in fairly good shape, but the stormwater program needs to be addressed and prioritized.

Board Member Stewart advised that the Environmental Protection Agency has a web page called Green Infrastructure. She observed that government practice has been to treat stormwater as an end of pipe solution, whereas low-impact development (LID) strategies attempt to incorporate infiltration as close to the site as possible. Allowing the marsh to do its ecological function will help, as well. The City needs to develop an approach to land development that works with nature to manage stormwater as close to its source as possible. When good LID strategies are implemented, the cost of projects, as well as stormwater costs, go down. Mr. Shuster announced that staff is close to having a draft of the new Stormwater Plan available for the Board's review. An open house has been scheduled for November 19th at the Edmonds Library. He noted the plan would allow LID techniques such as infiltration and bioswales where feasible. However, the City must be careful about how LID techniques are implemented given the type of soil that exists, steep hillsides, springs, and houses that are close together. He advised that the City is starting to incorporate LID concepts in some of the transportation projects. For example, they just met with the consultant for the Interurban Trail Project to discuss the option of bioswales and infiltration instead of a traditional stormwater system.

Board Member Stewart said it would be great if the City could develop an educational program for homeowners to encourage them to keep as much rain water as possible on their own site. It should be a community effort. Mr. Fiene pointed out that public involvement and education is another component of the NPDES permit.

THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Board Member Young said he supports forwarding the CFP to the City Council as written. Every department in the City does a great job with what they have to work with, but they do not sell themselves well enough and make strong enough policy recommendations. The marsh situation is an example that deserves some support, and he commended staff for addressing the issue as part of the Stormwater Plan, which is consistent with the draft Community Sustainability Element that is currently before the City Council for review and approval.

Board Member Young suggested that staff emphasize to the City Council the point that Edmonds' current stormwater rates are lower in comparison to other jurisdictions in the area. They also need to point out that rates have not been raised significantly for several years. The City Council needs to understand that because rates have stayed flat, certain projects and programs have had to be delayed. It would also be helpful to clearly outline those projects the City could move forward on if the rates were increased as recommended by the rate study.

Board Member Young said he supports the City Council's decision to use the \$20 TBD fee for operations and maintenance because the gas tax funds are not available right now. He encouraged the staff to be more positive when they present the CFP to the City Council. They have put together a great program, and they should show what could be done with a \$40 or \$60 TBD fee in the future. He reminded staff that there has been tremendous community support for walkway improvements. If they were to identify specific walkway projects that could be accomplished using the additional TBD revenue, the public would be more likely to support the fee increase. The City has gone through an extensive process which concluded that the City is understaffed, that staff is not overpaid, and that their utility rates are competitive. He suggested they work to sell a funding program to the citizens based on this information.

Board Member Young said he would support moving the CFP forward to the City Council on the condition that staff really sell the program, including the marsh situation, when they present the plan to the City Council. If they believe the water district funds should be used for street improvements, they should present their case to the City Council. Again, he emphasized that staff does a great job, but they should not be so humble when they present the plan to the City Council.

APPROVED

Board Member Works suggested that staff also emphasize to the City Council that surrounding cities are spending a much higher percentage of their budget on transportation. Mr. Fiene noted that the comparisons were compiled a few years ago. Mr. Fiene said the City Council needs to understand that if the City continues to spend proportionally less on their transportation system, it will eventually have a significant impact on their economic development opportunities. Board Member Works suggested that staff also point out how the plan coincides with the Community Sustainability Element which has not yet been formally approved by the City Council. She summarized that it would make sense to show that the City has been working with far less than most jurisdictions and it is time to make changes. She thanked the staff for all their hard work.

Board Member Clarke said he appreciates the comments made in the Stormwater Plan related to the Edmonds Marsh, but they do not really connect with the presentation made by members of Friends of the Edmond Marsh. If the Board forwards the CFP as written, there will be nothing about the Edmonds Marsh except the public comments that were provided during the hearing. There would be no action plan that would enable the group to move forward. Mr. Chave referred to the stormwater section of the proposed document, which identifies two projects related to the marsh; one for restoration work and another for daylighting Willow Creek. Both of these would indicate a program of study, follow up and improvements. Because the projects are identified in the CFP, the City has made a commitment to accomplish them. He suggested that perhaps it would be helpful to highlight these projects as part of the Board's recommendation to the City Council.

Board Member Clarke agreed that the stormwater section identifies two projects related to the marsh. However, he once again expressed his belief that neither of the two projects really address the issues raised by Friends of the Edmonds Marsh. He suggested the group's proposal is more of a park or environmental issue. Mr. Chave explained that stormwater covers a lot of different things, including environmental issues. Board Member Young suggested Board Member Clarke's concern has to do with selling and promoting and clarifying the relationship between the various elements, which should be part of the staff's presentation to the City Council.

Mr. McIntosh clarified that the marsh has always been handled as a partnership between the Parks Department and the Stormwater Utilities Department. It is the largest stormwater basin in the City. He noted that \$20,000 has been set aside in the parks budget in 2011 to produce a comprehensive environmental master plan for the marsh, including an ecological assessment and environmental impact statement. The public would be invited to participate in the process. He cautioned that nothing should be done to the marsh until there is good scientific data to support a future design proposal. He summarized that the marsh is an important piece of the park inventory, and the City has worked closely with the Deer Creek Hatchery to complete some storm restoration projects.

VICE CHAIR LOVELL MOVED THE BOARD FORWARD THE CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL WITH A RECOMMENDATION THAT PARTICULAR ATTENTION BE GIVEN TO THE ELEMENTS OF THE PLAN THAT FIT INTO THE BROAD PUBLIC, TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES AND SYSTAINABILITY ISSUES IN THE CITY. BOARD MEMBER YOUNG SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

THE BOARD TOOK A BREAK AT 8:52 P.M. THEY RESUMED THE MEETING AT 9:03 P.M.

FOLLOW UP ON JOINT MEETING WITH THE CITIZENS ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Board Member Lovell recalled that at the joint meeting, Mr. Clifton agreed to contact representatives from Mountlake Terrace and Bothell to arrange presentations at a future joint meeting. Mr. Clifton reported that he is working to coordinate a meeting date. Mr. Chave said he spoke with Chair Bowman, who agreed it is likely the Board would meet jointly with the Citizens Economic Development Commission (CEDC) prior to presenting their report to the City Council in January.

Board Member Clarke expressed concern that the group spent a lot of time throwing out ideas, but they did not identify a single action item that could be put forward as the number one priority to build from. Mr. Clifton said the objective of the meeting was intended to be an introduction of the Board and Commission and a brainstorming session. Staff is now working with the chairs of the two group s to create a framework and structure for moving forward.

APPROVED

Vice Chair Lovell recalled that at their September 30th meeting, he presented a draft idea for how the Board's report might be organized. He expressed concern that the two groups must produce a written report and strategy to the City Council in just a few months. He suggested they identify a format for the report and then divide the members into subcommittees to address the various elements and prepare draft language for the entire group to consider as they prepare their final report. He agreed to email his outline again to members of the Board. Mr. Clifton said Vice Chair Lovell's recommended outline fits in with staff's conversation of how the report should be structured. The CEDC has identified subcommittees who are working on certain topics such as reviewing past plans to identify the long-term goals and which ones have been implemented.

Vice Chair Lovell noted that the Board would only have one more meeting before the end of the year, yet they are supposed to give a report to the City Council on January 19th. He summarized that while they have a lot of information, they lack a format for preparing and presenting the report.

Board Member Stewart said she also prepared a draft outline that is similar to the one prepared by Vice Chair Lovell. She expressed concern that committees need to be working behind the scene, and she wants to make sure the Board has a role in the process. She said she likes the idea of breaking up the work and assigning subcommittees based on interest, but they also need to identify a structure for their final report.

Mr. Chave advised that the two chairs are talking about how to form working groups. The intent is that the working groups (subcommittees) would prepare elements of the final presentation for the Board and Commission to consider together prior to their presentation to the City Council. He emphasized that the first report would be an interim report to the City Council and not a formal, final document. It should identify the important things the City should focus on and outline a process. The Commission and Board could both identify things they want to work on. For example, one of the Board's priorities could be related to the Community Sustainability Element.

Vice Chair Lovell reminded the Board that both groups agreed that they wanted to present a cohesive presentation and recommendation to the City Council. Mr. Clifton agreed it will be important to present a report to the City Council that has a majority consensus agreement. In conversations with the two chairs, they are talking about putting together a group of individuals from the Commission and Board to meet with staff and the two chairs to figure out how to integrate the work of the two groups. He said he does not anticipate the January report would be the end all. It will be more of a progress report.

Board Member Clarke expressed his belief that the two groups need to have more focus as to where they want to concentrate their efforts. They need to identify their number one priority, as well as other issues they are passionate about. Mr. Chave agreed and said that will be the next step in the process. The previous work has been the brainstorming sessions, and the next phase will involve distilling the brainstorming ideas into a final report for the City Council.

Mr. Clifton pointed out that a number of proposals in past plans have already been implemented. When looking at the big picture, the Board and CEDC must keep in mind that politics, staffing time and funding will play a significant role in the implementation process. That means a majority of the City Council must agree to support a project or program before it can be implemented. He agreed they need representation from both the Board and the CEDC to provide some structure to future discussions. While the first few meetings were brainstorming sessions, it is time to move forward.

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

Mr. Chave reminded the Commission that they would elect a new Chair and Vice Chair for 2010 at their December 9th meeting. The agenda would also include a rezone hearing on a request by Mr. Shapiro for the Firdale Village property. He reminded them that the City Council approved the new zone, so it is now in the code. Mr. Shapiro is following up with an application to rezone the properties.

The Board discussed that the deadline for submitting names for the new park in the Meadowdale area is November 17th. Board Members Guenther and Clarke agreed to serve as a subcommittee to review the suggestions and make a recommendation for the Board to consider on December 9th.

APPROVED

Board Members Works and Young indicated that they would be leaving the Board at the end of the year. Mr. Chave said the City would advertise the vacant Board positions. The mayor would select individuals to fill the positions and present them to the City Council for confirmation.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

Vice Chair Lovell did not provide any comments during this portion of the meeting.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Board Member Young observed that in his entire eight years on the Planning Board, they have had adult entertainment on the extended agenda, yet there has never been a single public hearing on the subject. Mr. Chave explained that this item was placed on the extended agenda for a periodic status report to make sure they haven't zoned out the possibility for adult entertainment in Edmonds. He reminded the Board that years ago the City went through a process of hearings to establish rules in the land use codes to identify where adult entertainment business could be located. He emphasized that the City cannot change the code so there are no sites available for the use. He reported there are still locations on Highway 99 where an adult entertainment use could potential locate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Commission meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

APPROVED