

APPROVED JUNE 10TH

**CITY OF EDMONDS
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

May 27, 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
John Reed
Jim Young
Kevin Clarke
Judith Works
Valerie Stewart

STAFF PRESENT

Brian McIntosh, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director
Francis Chapin, Cultural Services Manager
Ranee McRae, Recreational Manager
Rich Lindsay, Parks Maintenance Manager
Robert English, City Engineer
Bertrand Hauss, Transportation Engineer
Karin Noyes, Recorder

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT

Michael Bowman, Chair (excused)
Cary Guenther (excused)

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER WORKS MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF MAY 13, 2009 BE APPROVED AS PRESENTED. BOARD MEMBER YOUNG SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

No changes were made to the agenda.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS

George Murray, Edmonds, commented that the Planning Board Meetings appear to be less formal than the City Council meetings. He referred to the decision the City Council recently made to uphold the Planning Board's recommendation to allow short-term rentals in Edmonds, particularly at a property located on Sunset Avenue. While he was not involved in the process, he is trying to find enough information to inform him of why the decisions were made, but it has been a difficult process. He noted that when the City Council approved the proposed amendment to allow short-term rentals, they had a lengthy discussion about applying an excise tax on the rental units so there would be equal footing with the Harbor Square Inn. He expressed his belief that this would result in a situation where short-term rentals in single-family zones would be treated as commercial uses. He said he has been unable to figure out exactly why the Board recommended approval of the change. He said he would like to keep Sunset Avenue intact and discourage short-term rentals. Mr. Murray referred to the recent City Council action to approve proposed amendments to Chapter 20 of the Edmonds Community Development Code. What was supposed to be an effort to clean up the code language resulted in a change in the procedures for appeals. He suggested these two issues should have been addressed separately. Again, he expressed concern that it is very difficult for citizens to obtain enough information to allow them to make intelligent comments as part of the public hearing process.

Vice Chair Lovell expressed his belief that the Planning Board Minutes were pretty clear as to the Board's thoughts regarding their short-term rental recommendation. They discussed the issue on at least two occasions, and their minutes provide a clear account of the Board's discussion and recommendation.

BRIEFING ON TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Mr. Hauss introduced Jennifer Barnes, from ICF Jones and Stokes, the consultant who helped staff put together the draft Transportation Master Plan Update. He explained that they were present to provide an overview of the Transportation Plan, as well as the financial outlook and potential funding scenarios for future transportation projects.

Mr. Hauss reviewed that since the last time the plan was presented to the Board, the staff and consultant have established a priority order for projects and programs based on input from a public open house, the Transportation Committee and City staff. The draft plan was reviewed by the Transportation Committee, and a brief was provided to the City Council's Community Service/Development Service Committee. Projects were further refined based on the staff and committee's feedback, and cost estimates, revenue projections and potential funding scenarios were prepared.

Mr. Hauss advised that the purpose of the Transportation Plan is to guide development of multimodal transportation, support the City's transportation goals and policies, and support projected land use through 2025. It includes the following elements:

- **Street System Element** – Mr. Hauss explained that this element provides an inventory of the existing streets and their characteristics. It evaluates operations and safety on each of the streets. A travel demand forecasting model was prepared to evaluate 2015 and 2025 future traffic conditions based upon the City's adopted land use plan. Projects and programs identified in this element include operations and safety improvements, a traffic calming program and maintenance and preservation.

Mr. Hauss advised that there are three types of roadway improvement projects: concurrency, safety, and highways of statewide significance. The projects were prioritized based on feedback from the Transportation Committee and the following criteria: safety, concurrency, grant eligibility, magnitude of improvements, and multimodal elements. He reminded the Board that concurrency is a State Law that requires transportation infrastructure be adequate to support planned land uses, and concurrency is measured based on the City's adopted Level of Service (LOS) Standard. The plan indicates that there are four existing locations where improvements are necessary to meet the concurrency requirement. Four additional locations would require improvements by 2015, and three more by 2025. Mr. Hauss reported that a traffic calming program was created as a future recommendation, recognizing that no funding is available for implementation. The plan would be applied to neighborhood residential through streets via a three-phase process: petition and preliminary review, education and enforcement and installation of a traffic calming device.

- **Non-Motorized Element** – Mr. Hauss reported that the non-motorized system element includes an inventory of existing walkway and bikeway facilities in the City. It evaluates connections and safety issues and recommends projects to improve pedestrian and bicycle mobility and safety. He referred to a map that illustrates the walkway projects that have been identified and prioritized by the Citizen Walkway Committee. It includes 10 short walkways and 19 long walkways. Five additional locations were recently forwarded to the Citizen Walkway Committee for possible inclusion in the plan. He noted that when preparing this element, consideration was given to pedestrian safety, connectivity to services and transit, surrounding land uses and infrastructure, proximity to schools, and environmental impacts.

Mr. Hauss reported that the proposed plan includes an Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Program, which involves upgrading intersection curb ramps to meet the ADA requirements. The Plan emphasizes that of approximately 350 intersections in Edmonds, only 42 fully meet the ADA requirements, and 24 partially meet the requirements. The program calls for upgrades based on the following priority: downtown, arterial streets, and intersections near community centers, senior center, health facilities, transit stops, schools, public buildings, and commercial areas and parks. He emphasized this is a future program recommendation, and no funding is currently available for implementation.

Mr. Hauss referred to the map outlining the proposed bicycle pathway improvements. He explained that the staff and consultant worked with the Bicycle Committee to recommend potential bicycle routes. The Committee recommended that

separate bicycle lanes be provided where feasible. Where separate lanes are not feasible, they recommend “sharrow” pavement markings to indicated shared use of the road by both bicycles and vehicles. The group also recommended locations for additional parking. He noted the map identifies three signed bicycle loops: short, medium and long.

- **Transit Element** – Mr. Hauss advised that the transit element of the Plan will identify potential bus stations. Staff is currently working with Community Transit to provide bus shelters and benches in locations where there is a high volume of transit use. They are also working with Community Transit to explore new bus routes.

Ms. Barnes provided a pie chart to illustrate the breakdown of the cost of various elements of the plan. She noted it is similar to the information that was provided previously to the Board, but the project costs have been refined and some new projects were added. She noted that while the Edmonds Crossing Project is mentioned in the Plan, it was not included as part of the financial assessment. She reported that the total cost of implementing all projects in the Plan would be about \$104 million. She advised that while the cost estimate is conservative, it is comprehensive and includes capital projects, different modes and maintenance and preservation costs. She noted that more than ¼ of the total cost of implementation is associated with preservation and maintenance projects. Safety, concurrency and walkway projects also involve a large percentage of the total cost of implementation.

Next, Ms. Barnes displayed a pie chart to illustrate the projected costs versus revenue. She explained that the projection was based on a continuation of past trends into the future. The consultant reviewed each of the funding sources the City has used in the past to project how they would continue into the future. Based on status quo continuing into the future, the revenue through the 2035 would be about \$37 million. This would include both secured and unsecured grant funding at the City’s current level. She advised that the consultant updated the impact fee based on new information, and the new estimate is \$1,071 per trip, which is about \$200 higher than the current fee.

Ms. Barnes summarized that based on the City’s current funding scenario, projected revenue would fund 23% of the plan through 2025. Road projects would be 22% funded, and pedestrian and bicycle projects would be 21% funded. The street overlay program would be on an 80-year cycle instead of the recommended 20-year cycle, and it would take 75 years to complete the ADA curb ramp retrofit program. The traffic calming program would remain unfunded.

Ms. Barnes referred the Board to the three funding scenarios that were provided as Attachment 3. She explained that the purpose of this exercise was to show what could be paid for based on a variety of funding scenarios. Based on feedback from the public and various committees, the staff and consultants tried to balance the projects that could be funded. She noted that projects that were at the top of everyone’s list were related to maintenance and preservation. There was also a strong indication that investments should be balanced modally. She reviewed that, based on the City’s current funding trends, a large portion of the revenue would come from impact fees, joint agency projects, and grant funding, and all three would require the City to provide a portion of the funding.

Ms. Barnes pointed out that based on the current funding scenario, the City would be unable to fully fund concurrency projects. While there would be sufficient funding to address the immediate deficiencies, there would be insufficient revenue to address deficiencies that are anticipated by 2015 and 2025. In order to balance concurrency in the future, the City must consider options to secure additional revenue, revise their land use plans to allow a lower level of development, shift allowed densities, and/or lower concurrency standards. She reviewed potential funding sources as follows:

- **Additional Grant Funding** – Grant funding could be limited by the City’s inability to provide matching funds.
- **Local Improvement Districts (LID)** – Local improvements districts would require property owners to pay into a fund for local improvements that will benefit them. However, implementation of this concept requires approval by the affected property owners.
- **Transportation Benefit District (TBD)** – The City Council recently approved a \$20 yearly license fee per vehicle, and State Law allows them to increase the fee to an amount up to \$100, if approved by the voters. She cautioned that they are not recommending this approach at this time, but felt it was important to recognize it as a potential funding option.

- **Business License Fee for Transportation.** Implementation of this fee would require extensive coordination with local business owners. This type of fee is typically used to fund improvements that are most beneficial to businesses.

Ms. Barnes provided a table that summarized the three future funding scenarios that were prepared by the staff and consultant. She summarized that based on the current funding scenario, there would be a shortfall of \$13.1 million by 2025. If the City were to initiate a TBD to increase the vehicle license fee an additional \$30 per year, the shortfall would be about \$3.8 million. An additional fee of \$60 would result in a shortfall of \$1.6 million, and \$80 would result in a shortfall of \$300,000. She noted that an \$80 TBD and implementation of a Business License Fee for Transportation could result in a situation where the cost and revenues balance out. Vice Chair Lovell inquired how many vehicles are licensed in the City each year, and Mr. McIntosh answered there are approximately 48,000. Ms. Barnes noted that the anticipated revenues were spread out over a 15-year period.

Vice Chair Lovell observed that the City Council already has their hands full trying to structure a tax levy just to get out of the financial hole they are in. He said the numbers identified in the plan could boggle their mind. Ms. Barnes agreed and emphasized that the purpose of the plan is to identify what the City wants to build in each of the categories, recognizing the reality of the current economy. In order to put the plan into perspective, the consultant and staff explored the order of magnitude of what the different sources of funding might purchase. The City Council is not required to commit to any particular funding option before adopting the plan, but it is important for the Plan to identify potential sources for additional revenue. Again, she reminded the Board that the cost and revenue projections are conservative, so there is some merit in waiting to see how things go for a few years before making any major decisions.

Board Member Young inquired how the City would use the \$1 million they received from the economic stimulus fund. Ms. Barnes answered that the money would be used for the 2009 overlay program. The annual cost of this program, based on a 20-year cycle, would be about \$1.7 million. The \$1 million would cover a large chunk of this year's overlay program, but it is not considered as part of the revenue projection because the Plan does not start until 2010.

Board Member Young complimented staff and Ms. Barnes for preparing a well-laid-out plan. He reminded them that the next step in the process is a public hearing, followed by a recommendation from the Board to the City Council. He suggested it would be helpful if the public hearing were to include a discussion about policy direction from the City Council to address the deficiencies in the Plan. In addition, if the City Council is going to consider the option of requesting additional fees from the citizens to support transportation, they should be prepared to show them what they would receive for their contribution. He suggested it might be appropriate to move forward with some of the small but valuable projects identified in the Plan as soon as possible, preparatory to any discussions regarding a TBD fee or business license fee. It will be important for the City complete some projects that can be used as examples when presenting the concept to the public. Ms. Barnes said that was the purpose of the supplemental funding scenarios. Board Member Young agreed but suggested it might be more strategic to move some of the funding around so that more small but valuable projects are 100% funded.

Also at the public hearing, Board Member Young suggested the consultant and staff clearly illustrate the funding opportunities the City could miss out on if they don't have matching funds available. He recalled there was strong consensus on the Tax Advisory Committee that it was in the City's best interest to spend money to make money. They should look at opportunities for investing dollars where they can get the best "bang for their buck." He expressed his belief that this could be a very persuasive argument that would be easily understood by the public. He said the consultant should also make it clear that there may not be a lot of grant funding available over the next two years.

Ms. Barnes said it is difficult to communicate the revenue and cost projections clearly to the public, but she agreed to revisit the summary and pull out more of the details. She summarized that many of the excellent points raised by Board Member Young could be addressed by the summary that was previously prepared. She emphasized that the consulting team and staff made some judgment calls on how funding could be allotted. For example, they could identify more funding for maintenance and preservation projects and less into other categories. However, they tried to balance all of the needs. She cautioned that the scenarios were meant to be illustrative of what the City could get for the dollars they spend. Again, she pointed out that if the City does not have the necessary revenue to provide matching funds, there is no point in pursuing grant funding opportunities or agency projects. She also noted that if the City doesn't have a certain level of revenue, they might

APPROVED

not be able to utilize all of the impact fees they collect, since the City is required to fund a portion of projects that involve impact fees. Board Member Young suggested the consultant emphasize this situation at the public hearing.

Board Member Works inquired if Stephen Clifton, Community Services Director, has reviewed the transportation Plan. She recalled that the 4th Avenue Corridor Project has been identified as an economic benefit to the City because it would connect the Edmonds Performing Arts Center to the businesses in the downtown core. She suggested language be added to the Plan to identify those projects that have economic development potential (i.e. increasing tax revenue). Ms. Barnes replied that the five criteria that were used to prioritize the projects did not include economic development. Board Member Works emphasized that the City is in a serious financial situation right now, and they must consider opportunities for economic development. Board Member Young agreed that the issue of economic development should be part of the public hearing discussion, but it is not really an issue for the Traffic Engineer to address. When they forward their recommendation to the City Council, the Board should suggest that economic development definitely be considered. He observed that the residents of Edmonds are at least receptive to the concept of spending money to generate revenue.

Vice Chair Lovell observed that if the City were willing to spend money to enhance elements of the plan in conjunction with a development, the developer would benefit and the City would be in a better position to implement some impact fees to pay for roadway and walkway improvements. He noted that some funding has already been identified for the 4th Avenue Corridor Project to move forward. Mr. Hauss clarified that the Cultural Services Manager is in the process of applying for grant funding for the project. However, because the project would not be considered a safety or capacity improvement, it would not be included in the Transportation Plan. Ms. Chapin agreed that the 4th Avenue Corridor Project would not meet the criteria for inclusion in the Transportation Plan. Vice Chair Lovell agreed but noted the Cultural Services Manager could work together with the Traffic Engineer to accomplish a project that involves more than just getting from Point A to Point B.

Board Member Clarke emphasized that the Transportation Plan is driven by certain State and local laws, and the 4th Avenue Corridor Project is not considered a necessary project based on the priorities of the Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Barnes pointed out that while the Transportation Plan does not provide a lot of detail regarding 4th Avenue, the walkway portion would be part of the Plan. She summarized that the ultimate goal of the Plan is transportation, whether it be walkways, bikeways, or roadways.

Ms. Barnes explained that the City has a legal mandate to identify infrastructure to support future land uses. The City's policies are outlined in a chapter of the Transportation Plan and lay out the policies for the different modes of transportation. The local policies drive the plan just as much as the State mandates. She reminded the Board that safety and maintenance and preservation have been identified as high priorities in Edmonds. She agreed it is challenging when there is a very long list of important goals and policies to achieve with limited funding. That is why it is important for the Transportation Plan to provide the City with information about where it stands now so the City Council can determine the best approach for moving forward.

Board Member Reed asked who determined the funding levels of projects identified on the three funding scenarios. Ms. Barnes answered that the consulting team worked with City staff to prepare the scenarios for the purpose of illustration, and they are very interested in the Board's feedback regarding project priority. She emphasized that the money was allocated theoretically amongst the different categories in an attempt to achieve a balance at each funding level. She added that roadway projects were prioritized based on the criteria laid out in the Plan. Board Member Young suggested the consultant and staff share the methodology they used to create the three funding scenarios at the public hearing. They should make it clear that the allocations are not set in stone and could be changed without being in violation of State law. He concluded that the policies identified in the plan will determine what decisions can be made to enhance future funding opportunities.

Board Member Young said it would also be helpful for staff to point out at the public hearing the percentage of the City's existing street inventory that is classified as fair or below fair condition. He noted that there is a Federally-mandated way to measure the condition of pavement, and fair is the point where you need to think about repairs. Once a street gets below fair condition, the replacement costs increase significantly. Ms. Barnes agreed it would be helpful to put the current situation into perspective, but they need to emphasize that paving would continue to degrade during the time period of the plan.

APPROVED

Vice Chair Lovell suggested that the funding scenarios identify those projects that are required by State law to meet the concurrency requirements. Ms. Barnes agreed to emphasize the four projects that fall into this category. She explained that these four existing deficiencies must be addressed within six years. Therefore, they must be identified in the six-year capital improvement plan as having a source of funding. The City has a longer time frame to address the anticipated deficiencies.

Board Member Stewart said she appreciates all the work the consulting team and staff put into the Transportation Plan, as well as the other individuals who participated in the process. She commented that the plan is very detailed and well laid out. It also provides some important financial options. She observed that when presenting the Plan to the City Council, it would be important to look at the rate of return on dollars spent. Funding certain projects could result in a significant rate of return to the City if grant funding is available.

Board Member Stewart expressed concern that concurrency is always based on projected vehicular traffic increases associated with growth and development. She reminded the Board that the City's goal is to become more sustainable and get people out of their cars. If there are fewer cars on the roadway, the maintenance costs would be reduced. She recalled a conference she recently attended where they discussed the Washington Vehicle Mile Reduction Law that was enacted in 2007. The law challenges the State to decrease vehicle miles traveled 18% by 2030 and 25% by 2035. If there were teeth behind this law, the City would be looking at decreasing cars on their roadways and providing more adequate transit opportunities. She noted that 79% of the Washington State Department of Transportation's budget is spent on highways and ferries. Any transportation options beyond that (walkway, transit, bikeway) are funded by voter approved taxes.

Board Member Stewart suggested the City needs to shift priorities as the State is trying to do. While she recognized it is challenging to move in that direction given the tough economic situation, the proposed Transportation Plan would continue the old fashioned method of identifying transportation needs without looking at opportunities for increasing transit. She said she would like to see more transit opportunities from downtown Seattle to Edmonds on the weekends so they can encourage people to come to Edmonds to shop and boost the economy. She noted that only three businesses in Edmonds take advantage of the Commuter Trip Reduction Law that was enacted in 1999 by giving their employees incentive to take the bus. Ms. Barnes clarified that the Plan states only three Edmonds businesses are required to comply with the law. The law requires that employers with more than 100 employees have a program in place to reduce miles traveled. Employers who have fewer employees do not have to report to the State, so the City does not have data on other business that participate in the program. Board Member Stewart suggested this be made clear in the Plan.

Board Member Reed observed that when he first reviewed the Transportation Plan he was overwhelmed by the large cost and revenue numbers. He suggested it would be helpful to show what the costs, revenue and deficit would be on a year-to-year basis. Board Member Young agreed this would help the public put the issue into perspective.

Board Member Clarke referred to the table that was prepared by the consultant to illustrate the future funding scenarios. He suggested it would be helpful to provide information at the public hearing as to how these numbers were calculated. Ms. Barnes agreed to provide more information, but she cautioned that the numbers are all based on projections.

Ms. Barnes referred to Board Member Stewart's earlier comment about the need to emphasize transit opportunities. She explained that Edmonds has a history of being roadway oriented and concurrency is very roadway oriented. City staff attempted to include a strong policy emphasis on transit. For example, chapters have been dedicated to the different modes of travel (bicycle, walkway and transit). She summarized that a lot of cities are working to enact a more multimodal level of service standard, but it is challenging. The proposed Plan provides policies to move in that direction to the extent possible by having such a high involvement with the walkway and bikeway groups. However, she noted that concurrency cannot be used as a tool to place emphasis on bikeway and walkway projects.

THE BOARD TOOK A BREAK AT 8:20 P.M. THEY RECONVENED THE MEETING AT 8:32 P.M.

UPDATE ON EDMONDS INTERURBAN TRAIL PROJECT

Brian McIntosh introduced Francis Chapin, Ranee McRae and Rich Lindsay who are all part of the Interurban Trail Project team. He announced that Mr. Hauss would be the project manger and engineer for the project, and he has worked closely

APPROVED

with the consultant. The City Engineer, Rob English, has also helped with the project. He pointed out that the Interurban Trail Project is part of the Transportation Plan and a very important project for the City.

Mr. McIntosh reported that completion of the Edmonds Interurban Trail segment has been in the works since early 2000. Originally, it was thought the project could be fully engineered and completed in-house, but the specifications and intricacies of the project made it very time consuming and KPFF Consulting Engineers were hired in 2004. The team is now in a good position to begin the final drive. He announced that pre-design and property acquisition have been completed. Project engineering should be completed late this year, with anticipated construction completed in 2010. He noted the estimated cost for the project is 1,937,141. Currently, funding for the project has been secured as follows: State of Washington RCO/WWRO Grant for \$577,000, a PSRC CMAQ Grant for \$250,000, and \$1,220,141 from the Parks 121 Fund. Staff is seeking three additional funding possibilities. They have a very good chance of receiving up to \$500,000 from the 2009 Countywide STP CMAQ Funding Competition. In addition, Congressman Inslee has submitted a high-priority request for \$1 million from SAFETEA-LU, and Senator Murray has submitted a request for \$900,000 from the FY2010 Transportation Appropriation. Staff is very hopeful that one of these options will be successful to help offset the impact on the City's 125 Fund.

Mr. McIntosh explained that because Edmonds is fully developed with density and hilly terrain, there are few opportunities to develop stand-alone recreational bicycle and pedestrian trails. Completion of the Interurban Trail in Edmonds would create an opportunity for recreationalists to connect to miles of regional recreational trails. It would also enhance access to other park resources in Edmonds, including the fresh water access and open space. He summarized that the project would provide a critical link to the regional trail system for recreational walkers, skaters and bicyclists by connecting to the Cities of Lynnwood, Mountlake Terrace and Everett to the north and the City of Shoreline, which links into the City of Seattle and the rest of King County to the South.

Mr. McIntosh pointed out that development of a shopping center at the King/Snohomish County line placed on top of the old Interurban Trolley line corridor inhibited the City's ability to complete 100% of their portion of the trail as non-motorized. In order to complete the link, portions of the route would be shared, on-street corridor connections. He provided a map to illustrate where the trail would share the roadway with motorized vehicles and explained that bicycle lanes would be added and the sidewalks would be improved.

Mr. McIntosh reminded the Board that the need for more urban and regional walking and biking trails is well documented in the park and recreation plans for all local governments in south Snohomish and north King Counties, as well as the two county comprehensive Plans. The Edmonds Parks, Recreation and Open Space Comprehensive Plan places the completion of the Edmonds portion of the trail as an essential need and a very high priority. Completion of this section would provide a safe recreational passage through a highly congested transportation corridor. It would also link with public spaces, schools, neighborhoods, and is adjacent to two Edmonds Parks and one Mountlake Terrace Park. He said neighboring jurisdictions have found that completion of Interurban Trail sections has resulted in steady growth in park users. He summarized that the Edmonds project would meet identified local and regional needs by:

- Completing a vital missing link in the Everett to Seattle Interurban System to enable a continuous unbroken trail.
- Providing local recreationalists and commuters the safe opportunity to access extensive interconnecting regional trail systems.
- Meeting the local and regional compelling need for additional miles of paved recreational trails.
- Creating and preserving access to additional linear park and open space.

Mr. McIntosh provided pictures to illustrate the existing condition of the trail site in Edmonds. He also provided pictures to illustrate the developed trail to the south in Shoreline and a few blocks north in Lynnwood. He noted that the Edmonds section would connect these portions and match in width and design to ensure trail consistency. He observed the historical theme of the Interurban Trolley and the colorful neighborhoods through which the trail passes, which would be an important design element. He said that in order to highlight historical significance and to create a respite along the trail, a trailhead area would provide a shelter with educational and interpretive features. In addition, a kiosk would provide informational trail maps and guidelines. A water fountain would be an amenity added through the City's gift program. These facilities would be located along 76th, which would allow for ease of maintenance and public transportation is nearby. He said traffic

calming strategies would be employed at the major crossing at 76th Avenue, and the Interurban Rail log signing and theme would be used to ensure consistency whenever there is an entry or exit from the trail.

Mr. McIntosh noted the northern portion of the non-motorized trail lies on 74th Avenue, and would be developed as a 12-foot wide standard paved path with 2-foot gravel shoulders. Landscaping and creation of view corridors would provide scenes of the mountains and Lake Ballinger. The southern portion would also be developed as a 12-foot wide standard non-motorized recreational path. This location is a trailhead portion that provides a neighborhood connection and lies adjacent to the Mathay-Ballinger Park. Again, he explained that the development of a shopping center blocked the City's ability to continue the Interurban Trail on the original rail bed to the south, and completion of this connecting piece would ensure that this would not occur again in the future. He advised the City has spent several years negotiating with the PUD, private property owners, and a lengthy "quiet title" action through the courts to ensure this security.

Mr. McIntosh summarized that the Edmonds project would be a vital north/south and east/west connector. Beginning in the north, Snohomish County's Interurban Trail follows the vacated trolley right-of-way. The Interurban Trail in Everett connects easterly to the Snohomish County Centennial Trail, which runs north/south along Highway 9 from Snohomish County to Lake Stevens. Eventually, the Centennial Trail will be 30 miles long, branching north to the Skagit County line. The south connection to the Edmonds project is Shoreline and links to Seattle's Interurban sections and the Burke/Gilman Trail, as well as 14 miles of the King County Interurban Trail. In south King County it combines with an eastern link to the eventual 45-miles along the Green River Trail System and eastern I-90 route of the Washington State Parks Iron Horse Trail. The Edmonds project's eastern connection is to the City of Mountlake Terrace at 228th Street, which travels east along Lake Ballinger through Mountlake Terrace to Lake Forest Park. The southern route of the Burke-Gilman Trail starts in Kenmore, on the north side of Lake Washington and reaches east to Redmond and connects to the Sammamish River Trail.

Mr. McIntosh shared that the Interurban Trail is not only a regional asset but is beneficial to the neighborhoods through which it passes. The City's Walkway Plan points out local neighborhood "feeder" streets at 236th and 240th Streets, as well as the 76th Avenue route that provides north/south sidewalk access. Edmonds/Woodway High School is located just one mile north of the proposed trail segment, and Chase Lake Elementary School and five City parks lie within a 10-block radius. East of the project is Ballinger Park, an RCO funded park with ball fields, playgrounds, a golf course and boat and fishing access. Edmonds' Lake Ballinger Access is adjacent to the project and provides opportunities at the waterfront (the only public water access point along the trail), as well as a resting point for trail users. Mathay/Ballinger Park, also in Edmonds, has parking, playground, picnic and portable restroom facilities and lies along the PUD right-of-way west of 76th Avenue.

Mr. McIntosh observed that in a highly urbanized landscape, the Interurban Trail would provide opportunities for wildlife habitat connections, particularly the Edmonds non-motorized portion. For example, the northern 1000 feet lies adjacent to a park with native vegetation and nesting opportunities for waterfowl and native bird species, and the southern corridor provides respite within a 100-foot wide and 1000-foot long native undeveloped portion. The Edmonds portion would become the perfect opportunity for trail users to take a break and enjoy northwest wildlife habitat.

Mr. McIntosh announced that support for the project is extensive. Several community meetings were conducted over the past few years, the most recent being July 17, 2008, which was attended by over 60 neighbors and citizens. The neighborhood has responded positively and understands that this project would be a benefit to both their security and quality of life.

Mr. McIntosh pointed out that the at-grade trail corridor eliminates the need for major bridge and tunnel infrastructure costs. The site is level and the rough grading requirements would be reduced due to the previous placement of the rail corridor. In-house construction management would represent a significant cost savings. In addition, the project would be located on the PUD right-of-way through a cooperative partnership, eliminating the need for property acquisition. The use of native plants would eliminate the need for irrigations systems, as well. He summarized that staff is excited about moving the project forward.

Board Member Works requested more information about the improvements that would be made to side streets. Mr. McIntosh said sidewalk improvements and bike lanes would be done from 76th Avenue to Mathay-Ballinger Park. Board Member Works asked staff to share why the residents who live along the proposed trail feel the project would improve

security. Mr. McIntosh said that numerous trails have been constructed throughout the country. While people initially fear crime will increase as a result of providing easy access to the rear of properties, studies show just the opposite. The more people who use the trail, the safer the surrounding properties become. He noted that a crime watch officer was present at the last public meeting to explain this concept.

Board Member Stewart said it is wonderful that the Edmonds portion of the Interurban Trail is finally going to be constructed. She asked if the plan identifies an overpass to cross SR 104. Mr. McIntosh answered that no overpass would be provided. Trail users would have to cross the street using the existing stop lights. An overpass would be an expensive element.

Board Member Reed inquired if funding has already been secured for the entire cost of the project. Mr. McIntosh said the City has received some secure grants, and the remainder of the funding would come from the Parks 125 Fund unless the City can obtain another grant funding, which they are hoping to do. He summarized that the Parks 125 fund has sufficient funding to pay for the remainder of the project even if the City does not obtain more grant funding. However, he emphasized that the City Council would have to formally approve the expenditure. Once the engineering design work has been completed, staff would present the proposal to the City Council for approval to go out to bid. Hopefully, they will have secured more grant funding by that time.

Board Member Young asked where the Interurban Trail Project ranks in the PSRC Committee's list of non-motorized projects. Mr. McIntosh said the project was included on the list, but no priorities have been assigned to date. He noted that the City Engineer, Rob English, participates on the committee that will rank the various projects, and they are scheduled to start the process next week. The City should know the priority of their project by mid June.

Board Member Reed inquired if the project could be done in phases if sufficient funding is not available to complete the work at the same time. Mr. McIntosh answered affirmatively, but cautioned that the City must provide matching funds in order to secure the state grant funding. He added that this type of project would be difficult to construct in a phased program, so their goal is to complete the entire project at the same time.

Board Member Clarke said he is excited about the plan to complete the Edmonds portion of the Interurban Trail. He recalled that his parents moved from Lake Forest Park to 79th Avenue West in Edmonds about 50 years ago, and his neighbor was George Mathay, a relative of one of the City's early settlers. He and his friends used to ride their bikes along the rail corridor, going all the way from their home to Lake Ballinger. It was a dirt trail all the way.

Board Member Clarke pointed out that a portion of Shoreline's trail is located across the street from the transit center. They have provided an asphalt parking lot adjacent to the trail, with 10 to 15 stalls and some benches. People use the parking area to dismount their bikes and ride and there is no other area to the north that allows this to occur. He noted that the parking Lot at Mathay-Ballinger Park provides approximately four parking spaces, and one is ADA accessible. Because this park is located near the trail head for the Edmonds segment, he suggested the City provide additional parking in this location so that people can unload their bikes and head north through the more scenic portion of the trail. Perhaps this additional parking could be located in the southwest corner of the park where the road elbows or on the east side of the street with a foot path to the park. A parking area could also be provided further to the south so that access was available at both ends of the park. Mr. McIntosh agreed that is something to consider. The only parking the design team has considered to date is along 76th Avenue, where parking studies have indicated the area is underutilized. He noted that 76th Avenue would be in close proximity to the kiosk and transit station, as well.

Board Member Clarke advised that Mathay-Ballinger Park does not provide a year-round sanican, nor is there one available during the summer months. If this park is to become a trailhead for the Interurban Trail, the City should consider the option of providing this service. Mr. McIntosh agreed and said that this decision could be made quickly once the usage level of the park has been identified, and there is room at the park for the installation of a sanican. Board Member Clarke summarized the location proposed for the City's portion of the trail is a beautiful area that is unique to Edmonds, with the fresh water lake, views and wildlife.

APPROVED

Mr. McIntosh inquired if Board Member Clarke still has connections with the Mathay Family. He said the City is interested in contacting the descendents of the early settlers and inviting them to the opening ceremony event. Board Member Clarke indicated he lost touch with the family over the years.

AQUATICS FEASIBILITY STUDY UPDATE

Mr. McIntosh reviewed that the Aquatic Feasibility Study Committee consisted of a City Council Member, staff members, citizens, and consultants. He noted that Board Member Lovell participated on the Committee on behalf of the Board. He further reviewed that the Aquatics Feasibility Study process started last summer with a comprehensive consultant selection process. There were 21 inquires, 8 statements of qualifications, 4 interviews and the team of NAC Architecture, Water Technology, and Ballard King Associates was selected. This consultant team has worked on many projects in the northwest, and they know the King/Snohomish County area very well.

Mr. McIntosh reported that since their selection, the consultants and the advisory committee have been working on several major phases of the scope of work, including an existing facilities review, an evaluation of site options, a market analysis, an operations analysis, a citizen survey, development of project options, stakeholder meetings and public meetings. He noted that he would use the presentation that was presented by the consultant at the May 6th public meeting as the basis for his update. He said the purpose of tonight's meeting is to inform the Board of what has been done so far, share the survey results, explain the concept of a recreational leisure pool, share the various concept options and solicit input from the Board. He reviewed the survey results as follows:

- Forty percent of the respondents indicated they had used the pool over the past two years, most particularly for recreational swimming.
- The citizens indicated that the most popular water features would include hot tub or Jacuzzi, lap lanes, lazy river, an area of deep water for diving, waterslides and a shallow area for children.
- The greatest number of citizens indicated support for improving Yost Park Pool and enclosing it as an indoor pool. However, many expressed support for improving Yost Park Pool and continuing to operate it as an outdoor pool. Also, many expressed interest in both a new indoor pool and a new outdoor pool.
- More people indicated support for improving the existing Yost Pool Park and enclosing it as an indoor pool. However, there as also significant support for improving the summer only outdoor pool at Yost Park, building a new indoor pool adjacent to and in cooperation with the Harbor Square Athletic Club and building a new aquatic center with an indoor and outdoor pool at Yost Park.
- Half of the respondents indicated they would support additional taxes to pay for a renovated or new pool. About 28% indicated they would not, and 22% were undecided.

Mr. McIntosh provided the following examples of the various elements that could be included in a new or renovated aquatics center:

- Competitive swimming and diving areas
- Wellness and therapy areas, which would be of particular interest to Edmonds aging population
- Zero depth areas, where people could walk into the pool without using steps
- Spray play features
- Participatory climbable water play structures
- Flow channel that could also be adjusted to a certain resistance for use as therapy
- Activity zones for basketball, rope climbing, etc.
- Water slides

APPROVED

Mr. McIntosh referred to the concepts that were prepared by the consultant based on survey results and citizen and committee feedback. In addition to the four concepts prepared by the consultant, the City also has the option of leaving Yost Pool as it is and continuing to maintain it. He reviewed each of the concepts as follows:

- **Concept 1** –Yost Pool would continue as an outdoor only pool, operating from Memorial Day to Labor Day. The existing lap pool would be reused, and the pool systems equipment would be replaced. A new leisure pool would be constructed, and the existing pool house would be replaced. An additional 60 parking spaces would be provided to accommodate the demand. The idea would be to make the new parking area appear similar to the existing parking area, with a lot of trees and vegetation. There would be some site impacts associated with this concept. The cost of Concept 1 would be \$8.2 million. A voter approved levy to fund the project would result in an additional average annual tax of \$35.51 per household. The estimated annual operating cost deficit would be between \$0 and \$50,000.
- **Concept 2** – This concept calls for an indoor only pool at Yost Park that would operate year round. The existing pool and pool house would be demolished, and new indoor lap and leisure pools would be constructed. Again, additional parking would be provided to accommodate the increased demand, and there would be some site impacts. The total estimated cost of the project is \$21.9 million. A voter approved levy to fund the project would result in an additional average annual tax of \$95.40 per household. The estimated annual operating cost deficit would be between \$200,000 and \$300,000. Because of the higher operating costs associated with this concept, it may be necessary to have a maintenance levy to support the pool. This would result in an additional annual tax of about \$10 per household.

Vice Chair Lovell pointed out that operational costs for indoor pools are dramatically higher than for outdoor pools, even though they typically only operate for three months a year. There are no indoor pools that are fully funded by revenues they generate. Even the best case scenarios require a subsidy of between 10% and 20%. Revenue generated for year-round activity would never be enough to fully pay the operating costs.

Vice Chair Lovell recalled that some citizens felt the City should maintain Yost Pool in its current situation, and they did not need all the fancy stuff that was recommended by the consultant. However, the consultants emphasized repeatedly that the City would need to provide a variety of activities and pertinences that go along with aquatic centers if they want to attract families and generate additional revenue through fees. Even with the additional amenities, the City would still be required to subsidize their aquatics center.

Mr. McIntosh added that Mountlake Terrace has done a good job of renovating their pool and adding amenities. While the pool is not self-supporting, the subsidy is much lower than in most other cases. They have done a great job of drawing families. On the other hand, the Shoreline pool does not provide amenities, and it is subsidized (about \$850,000) by the City of Shoreline. This pool only generates about \$350,000 annually in revenue. Vice Chair Lovell noted that the Mountlake Terrace Pool generates about 90% of their required revenue through fees and programs. However, they have an advantage in that their equivalent of the Anderson Center is at the same site.

- **Concept 3** – Concept 3 would provide both an indoor and outdoor pool at Yost Park. A new indoor lap pool would be added, as well as a new therapy pool and whirlpool. A new outdoor leisure pool would be constructed, as well. Additional parking would be provided and there would be some site impacts associated with implementation of the concept. The total estimated cost of the project is \$16.7 million. A voter approved levy to fund the project would result in an additional average annual tax of \$72.61 per household. The estimated annual operating cost deficit would be between \$150,000 and \$250,000. A portion of the facility would be operated year round, which was important to many of the citizens.
- **Concept 4 and Concept 1** – This concept involves the City working in partnership with Harbor Square Athletic Club to provide a year-round facility at Harbor Square. Yost Pool would continue to operate as an outdoor pool during the summer months. A new indoor lap pool, spray deck and outdoor lap pool would be constructed at Harbor Square. The total estimated cost of the project is \$17.4 million. A voter approved levy to fund the project would result in an additional average annual tax of \$75.49 per household. The estimated annual operating cost deficit would be between \$25,000 and \$120,000.

Mr. McIntosh explained that this concept would require the City to work in partnership with a private entity, which is doable but requires careful negotiations. He shared examples of the issues that would have to be resolved and negotiated. He noted that the Harbor Square Athletic Club is located on publicly owned land (Port of Edmonds). Therefore, construction costs would be higher because public agencies are required to meet different rules than private developers.

Board Member Clarke pointed out that this option would require someone to pay the Port a ground lease rent for the use of the land. The other options would utilize property the City already owns. Mr. McIntosh said the idea is that the Harbor Square Athletic Club would operate and maintain the pool. While the Port has indicated support for the concept, it would be tricky to negotiate all of the issues and concerns.

Board Member Stewart inquired if consideration was given to the option of providing a retractable roof. Mr. McIntosh said this concept was discussed, but the consultants were not eager to recommend a convertible type roof. In the long run, they do not typically pay off. Vice Chair Lovell added that air supported roofs are even less energy efficient, and retractable roofs are costly to repair and maintain. For example, it costs \$15,000 to \$30,000 each time an air supported roof put up or taken down. He noted that Lynnwood has fixed wood arches over their pool, and they are starting a \$30 million renovation of the facility using the same design consultants as those used by the City of Edmonds for the Feasibility Study. Their pool will be closed for a year. They plan to eliminate the temporary enclosure and use moving panels on the walls and sky lights instead. This will allow them to open and close the facility depending on the weather. He emphasized it will be extremely costly for Lynnwood to operate their new facility.

Vice Chair Lovell recalled that some members of the community suggested the City put a bubble cover over Yost Pool. However, he expressed his belief this would not be a cost-effective option. He said that, in his experience with indoor pools, the moisture in the air contains chlorine, which is very corrosive, making it costly to maintain the facility. While a covered pool would be a Class A facility in Edmonds and would draw people from the surrounding communities, it would be a costly endeavor for the City to take on.

Mr. McIntosh said he invited the consultants to comment on the economic impact associated with bringing visitors to Edmonds via a regional aquatic center. He also asked them to comment on the economic impact to neighborhood property values that would result if Yost Pool were to cease to exist.

Mr. McIntosh summarized that the update was provided for the Board's information, and no action is required at this time. Staff believes the study provides sufficient information to present the various concepts to the City Council. At that time, the consultants would make a recommendation as to their preferred option. He suspects the City Council would utilize the study within the next three to five years, depending on the economic climate, as well as other factors. Vice Chair Lovell summarized that the study could be used as an information platform for moving forward with an aquatic facility in Edmonds in the future.

Vice Chair Lovell said he was invited by some citizens to visit the Klahaya Swim Club, a private swim club that was just renovated at a cost of about \$1.2 million. He emphasized that because of state requirements, renovating Yost Pool would be significantly more costly.

Board Member Reed inquired if any of the schools in the district provide pool facilities. Mr. McIntosh answered that there are no swimming pools, but there are some therapy pools. He noted that neighboring districts do provide pool facilities.

Board Member Clarke said that in his professional practice, he is involved with recreational facilities. With the newly renovated Mountlake Terrace Pool and the anticipated renovation of the Lynnwood Pool, he questioned if the demographics would support an additional aquatic center in Edmonds. He noted that the student population in the Edmonds School District has declined and the number of people who can afford housing in this area is a concern. He asked if the study addressed whether Edmonds would be competing with other facilities and if there is enough demand for a new facility. He emphasized that the Klahaya Swim Club is a beautiful facility, and he suggested the biggest bang for the buck is in private clubs, which are significantly different than what the City can provide.

Mr. McIntosh said the consultants are very aware of the market demand, and staff does not know what their preferred option will be. However, there are certain parts of the concepts that work better than others, particularly given the competition. He said the issue of market demand would be addressed in the final study document. He agreed with Board Member Clarke that the cost of private pool facilities is much lower than public facilities.

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

Mr. McIntosh announced that the naming contest for the South Edmonds Park is in process, and the deadline for submittals is May 29th. Once the list of names has been assembled, they would be presented to the Board at a public hearing. The Board would be responsible for reviewing the list and making a recommendation to the City Council.

Vice Chair Lovell announced that the Highway 99 Task Force is scheduled to meet with the Board on July 8th. No meeting date has been set for the joint meeting with Stevens Hospital representatives.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

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

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Board Member Reed referred to the minutes of the Board's last meeting, where they discussed the option of holding special meetings in order to accomplish all of the tasks before them. He suggested the Board consider holding a retreat type of meeting where they could tackle particular items.

ADJOURNMENT

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

APPROVED