

APPROVED JULY 22nd

**CITY OF EDMONDS
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

July 8, 2009

Chair Bowman called the meeting of the Edmonds Planning Board to order at 7:02 p.m. in the Council Chambers, Public Safety Complex, 250 – 5th Avenue North.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Michael Bowman, Chair
Philip Lovell, Vice Chair
John Reed
Cary Guenther
Kevin Clarke
Valerie Stewart

STAFF PRESENT

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager
Brian McIntosh, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director
Renee McRae, Recreational Manager
Debbie Dawson, Animal Control Officer
Carl Nelson, Chief Information Officer
Karin Noyes, Recorder

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT

Jim Young (excused)
Judith Works (excused)

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER REED MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF JUNE 24, 2009 BE APPROVED AS AMENDED. VICE CHAIR LOVELL SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

A question and answer period with Debbie Dawson, Animal Control Officer, was added to the agenda as Item 5a. The remainder of the agenda was accepted as presented.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS

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

DISCUSSION WITH ANIMAL CONTROL OFFICER REGARDING PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE EDMONDS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE (ECDC) TO ALLOW THE KEEPING OF DOMESTIC FEMALE FOWL IN SINGLE-FAMILY ZONES (FILE NUMBER AMD-09-7)

Mr. Chave reminded the Board of their previous discussion regarding a proposed amendment that would allow property owners in single-family residential zones to keep up to three hens. He advised that at the request of the Board, Debbie Dawson, Animal Control Officer, was present to speak with them about whether or not the existing animal control regulations would adequately address all potential issues related to the proposed change.

Ms. Dawson explained that the current regulations provide the City the ability to address situations where animals run at large, as well as situations related to noise and smell. She said she does not believe that keeping hens would result in any significant noise problems, but problems could arise as a result of hens being allowed to run at large. She noted that just last month an animal control officer spent more than an hour trying to run down four chickens, and housing stray chickens is problematic, as well. At this time, the City contracts with an outside agency to provide housing for stray dogs and cats. While they also have a coop, they are not really set up to house chickens. There would also be issues with what to do with chickens that are not claimed. While the City has been able to place all their stray dogs and cats, she is not sure this would be possible with farm animals. She also noted that while it is easy to pick up dog and cat matter to keep a property free of odor, it is more difficult to keep chicken areas clean. She noted that the zoning code does address the issue of coop location.

Board Member Reed inquired if the current regulations make any distinction regarding coop size and whether or not it is covered. Mr. Chave answered that the current regulations do not speak to these two issues, but they do talk about where coops can be located relative to property lines. He said he would suspect that in most situations, owners would provide some type of covered shelter for their hens. He summarized that regulations related to how animals are kept are located in Chapter 5 of the Edmonds Municipal Code, and regulations pertaining to use are located in the Edmonds Community Development Code. Ms. Dawson added that the current regulations require that animals be kept appropriate for the climate and weather. She suggested that perhaps the regulations could be amended to require that hens be put away at night.

Board Member Stewart inquired if the current regulations provide any guidelines specifically related to the care of chickens. Ms. Dawson answered that there are none, but she said she has written tickets for loose chickens.

Chair Bowman asked Ms. Dawson to identify any particular problems that have come up related to chickens that the Board should be aware of. Ms. Dawson pointed out that keeping chickens is becoming a popular use in single-family zones. However, it is important to remember that Edmonds is a City, and she is not sure that every property owner who wants to have urban chickens has really thought about how they would care for them. Chair Bowman asked Ms. Dawson to share recent situations that have come up related to chickens. Ms. Dawson replied that four situations came up just in the last month, and two the month before. Chair Bowman inquired if the City has received any complaints from property owners about their neighbors keeping chickens. Ms. Dawson answered that they have received complaints. Because many of the chickens are not registered as required by the zoning code, the animal control officers have encouraged property owners to cease the use.

Ms. Dawson explained that there are only 8 to 12 property owners in the City of Edmonds who are legally allowed to keep chickens, and the chickens must be registered. Mr. Chave further explained that when the City code was changed to prohibit the keeping of chickens, a grandfather provision was included that allowed people who were keeping chickens to register their chickens and continue the use into the future. Ms. Dawson emphasized that some property owners are keeping chickens without registering them because the provision is not applicable to their situation.

Mr. Chave reminded the Board that the City Council has requested they consider whether or not it is appropriate for the City to allow property owners in single-family zones to keep up to three hens. This use is not currently allowed unless property owners registered their chickens during that brief period of time several years ago.

Vice Chair Lovell recalled that when the Board last discussion the proposed amendment, their main concern was where the description and criteria related to the use would be located in the City's current codes and regulations. Mr. Chave advised that there is no language specific to chickens in the current code; only provisions that deal with animals in general. If the proposed amendment is adopted to allow the keeping of up to three hens, animal control would use the existing general provisions to regulate the use based on situations related to noise, smell, etc. He further explained that, currently, if a complaint is issued regarding the actual use, the situation would be addressed by the City's code enforcement officer because chickens are not allowed in the City in most situations. However, if the chickens are legally registered, the animal control officers would be responsible for addressing complaints and problems. If the zoning code is changed to allow up to three hens in single-family zones, any situations that come up as a result of the allowed use would be addressed by an animal control officer rather than the code enforcement officer.

APPROVED

Board Member Stewart requested that Ms. Dawson provide suggestions about what might be included in the Edmonds Municipal Code to address future concerns. Ms. Dawson agreed to review the existing language to see if anything needs to be added specific for chickens.

Board Member Clarke inquired who would be responsible for amending the animal control regulations. Mr. Chave explained that proposed amendments to Chapter 5.05 of the Edmonds Municipal Code would be put forth by the Police Department, with some discussion with Planning Department Staff to ensure consistency between the Edmonds Municipal Code and the Edmonds Community Development Code. He noted that amendments to the Edmonds Municipal Code could go directly to the City Council for a public hearing and final decision. He explained that the City Council referred the proposed amendment to the Planning Board for review because it is a zoning issue. The Board would not be required to make a recommendation related to animal control aspects. However, they could do so because of the direct relationship between the two.

Vice Chair Lovell suggested the Board could recommend approval of the proposed ordinance, with the provision that staff research guidelines related to the care of chickens and propose appropriate amendments to Section 5.05 of the Edmonds Municipal Code. Mr. Chave reminded the Board that they have not conducted a public hearing on the proposed amendment. He suggested the Board allow staff time to review Section 5.05 and recommend appropriate changes. While the Board would not be required to conduct a hearing on proposed changes to Section 5.05, they could be advertised as part of the proposed zoning code amendments.

Board Member Stewart pointed out that the City of Seattle recently amended their code to allow chickens in single-family zones. She suggested staff review their newly adopted language for additional guidance.

Mr. Chave agreed that staff would update the draft ordinance and present it to the Board at a future meeting along with additional research as to what might be appropriate to supplement the existing animal control regulations.

PUBLIC HEARING ON EDMONDS PLANNING BOARD'S PROCESS AND NAMING RECOMMENDATION FOR THE NEW PARK IN SOUTH EDMONDS

Mr. McIntosh reviewed that through a Park Naming Policy adopted by the City Council on March 24, 2009, the Planning Board was charged with recommending park names for new parks developed in Edmonds. The first park to be named in the City under the new policy is located at the site of the Old Woodway Elementary School in south Edmonds. The park is scheduled to open in July and an opening ceremony is scheduled for 10 a.m. on Saturday, August 8. With the help of the Parks and Recreation staff, naming proposals were solicited throughout the City and 88 names were submitted for consideration by the Planning Board. A subcommittee of the Planning Board was established to examine all the names, and they selected a short list of 12 names and recommended three names to present and discuss during a public hearing before the Planning Board. He noted that if the Board forwards a recommendation to the City Council at the end of the public hearing, the City Council would have an opportunity to review the recommendation and make a final decision on July 21st. This would allow plenty of time for staff to prepare a plaque prior to the opening ceremony on August 8th. Board Member Reed observed that while the adopted Park Naming Policy does not require the City Council to hold an additional hearing before making their final decision, they certainly have the option of doing so.

Cheryl Clarke, Edmonds, said she lives in the southwest part of Edmonds, and she thanked the City for purchasing the school property for a beautiful park. She also thanked the Parks Department for taking into consideration the suggestions provided by citizens who live in the area. She expressed thanks to the Engineering Department for working with the property owners to address flood issues that have existed since the neighborhood was annexed into Edmonds in 1995. It is anticipated that the infiltration system that was installed underneath the new park would resolve the problem. Ms. Clarke asked that the Board recommend to the City Council that the new park be named after Dr. Robert O. Hickman, who has dedicated much of his life to the Edmonds Community. He has been a caregiver and mentor to her family for many years, as well as to many other families in the community. When he developed the Hickman Catheter, it was intended to help people who needed medical treatment have a better quality of life and not for fame or monetary gain. He never applied for a patent or received any money for it.

APPROVED

Ms. Clarke said that many people in the community do not even realize that Dr. Hickman and his wife, Lucille have lived in the area for many years. They probably would not recognize him as a man who has done so much for others. Now he continues to serve others and exemplifies in quiet ways the joy and satisfaction that can come from serving others. She said it has been a privilege for her family to know Dr. Hickman and his wife. They have continued their ongoing contribution to the community, and he is not even aware that his name has been submitted as a possible name for the new park. Naming the park after Dr. Hickman would be a wonderful legacy for the many gifts he and his wife have given the community.

Allen Doman, Edmonds, asked that the Planning Board recommend naming the new park after an individual rather than a geographic or other concept. He noted that of the three names that have been put forth by the subcommittee, only one is after an individual. He recommended the park be named Hickman Park. He noted that a lot of public information about Dr. Hickman and his career can be found in his University of Washington Alumnus Profile. He said he knows Dr. Hickman as a man, father, citizen, friend and long-time member of the community. He noted that Dr. Hickman raised his family just a few blocks from the new park location, and he has devoted 1,000's of hours to volunteer community service; sometimes as a worker in the trenches, but often with heavy leadership responsibilities. He twice served as a bishop in his church congregation, and he was an ecclesiastical leader for a large church group in Snohomish County for nearly 10 years. Later, he served abroad in church activities in Haiti, and he also served at the BYU Center in Jerusalem.

Mr. Doman said that over 30 years ago, Dr. Hickman was the attending physician when his son passed away, and he provided professional and human therapy to him and his family. A few years later, one of his own children passed away, so he knows what others feel and experience. He has made and continues to make countless visits to friends who are ill. Last year when his wife was seriously ill, Dr. Hickman made an unsolicited visit to the hospital. As he entered the ICU and walked to where his wife was being treated, doctors and nurses recognized and acknowledged him with great regard and respect. He has humbly told people that they had to call the catheter something so they named it after him because they didn't think it would work. Mr. Doman summarized that he would like the City of Edmonds to recognize the accomplishments and service of Dr. Hickman by naming the park after him.

Roger Hertrich, Edmonds, said he was heavily involved in the siting for a much bigger park than the one that was actually constructed. He suggested that a good name for the much smaller park would be "no adult park." He pointed out that while the previous speakers had many good things to say about Dr. Hickman, it is important to note that he actually lives in Woodway and never lived in Edmonds. Therefore, his name is not as significant in this situation as someone else who has or does live in Edmonds. He suggested the park be named Petso Park, after Lora Petso, who has been more active than anyone else in the community in trying to save the whole park. She is a great lady who is still active in the City. Naming the park after her would be appropriate to recognize her effort to save the park for the citizens.

Alvin Rutledge, Edmonds, expressed his opinion that all 88 of the nominations should be recognized and forwarded to the City Council for consideration rather than just the three names recommended by the subcommittee. He observed that the significant number of nominations shows how much citizen interest in the park there is.

Colin Southcote-Want, Edmonds, said he was disappointed to see the three names recommended by the subcommittee: South Edmonds Community Park, Cherry Blossom Park, and Hickman Park. He felt the subcommittee's recommendation showed very little imagination, and none of the proposed names provide a sense for where the park is located. While the first two speakers provided emotional presentations in favor of naming the park after Dr. Hickman, he was surprised to find out that Dr. Hickman has never lived in Edmonds. While the nomination for "Hickman Park" included a great right up on Dr. Hickman, it carefully avoided mentioning the fact that he doesn't live in Edmonds. This information should have been made available up front.

Mr. Southcote-Want recalled that a year ago the Seattle area received a new professional soccer team, and the new owners proposed three potential new names, which did not include "Sounders." When they put the names out for a vote, over 50% of those who participated in the vote wrote in the name "Sounders." The owners listened to the people who voted. He expressed his belief that the list provided by staff did not do justice to the citizen nominations. He distributed a separate copy of the various names that were nominated. He observed that 34 of the nominations were for names associated with the Robin Hood Theme, 16 of the nominations were for names associated with other local themes, and 11 were associated with

park features. Nearly 50% of the people who submitted nominations wanted a Robin Hood Themed name, and he urged the Board to listen to the people.

Mr. Southcote-Want observed that the neighborhood immediately to the north of the new park is named Sherwood Village, and there are a number of street names throughout the area that are related to the Robin Hood Theme. People feel very strongly that a Robin Hood Theme would be most appropriate for the new park. He noted that only one of the nominations referred to "Southwest Community Park, and only three made reference to the cherry tree or cherry blossoms. He suggested that if the Board does not recommend a name that is related to the Robin Hood Theme, they would be ignoring what the people have asked for.

Rob Trahms, Edmonds, said he is excited about the new park, and he congratulated the Parks Department on their efforts. They did a fantastic job of soliciting input and designing the park. He also recognized the efforts of **Claude ??** who was instrumental in the park design. While he would have preferred an 11-acre park, the 5.5 acre park is good the way it has been designed and developed. He said he was disappointed in the three names recommended by the subcommittee. None of the proposed names recognize how the park came about and the enormous amount of citizen involvement that took place. While he does not have any suggestions for what the name should be, he observed that a large percentage of the nominations were related to the Robin Hood Theme. He said his only concern is that the park not be named Sherwood Park, since it would be easily confused with Sherwood Elementary School. He encouraged the Board to find a way to recognize citizen involvement. He summarized that if it had not been for outpouring of community involvement to work countless hours with the City and school district, the project would not likely have moved forward. It is important to recognize that good things can happen when citizens get involved.

Jan Robertson, Edmonds, praised Brian McIntosh and the remainder of the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Department staff. The successful neighborhood meetings allowed the neighbors an opportunity to voice their concerns and desires for the Park, and City staff listened and made themselves available to answer their questions. For many years the City has been criticized because it appeared their emphasis was on the bowl area, and this new park is a beautiful addition to South Edmonds.

THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Board Member Clarke expressed appreciation for the public's participation. He observed that those who have reviewed the list of 88 nominations will realize that a number of the names associated with the Sherwood or Robin Hood Theme were submitted without any justification as to why they would be appropriate for the new park. Five or six of the nominations were grouped together and appeared as though someone was trying to "stuff" the ballot box to create random names associated with Sherwood. He said he attended Woodway Elementary School, as well as other schools in the area, while he lived in the Lake Ballinger area.

Board Member Clarke agreed that Sherwood Forest has a name recognition in the community, but the most recently named institutions in that area all have the name "Woodway." For example, Woodway Elementary School was created in the 1950's, and Woodway High School in 1969. When Woodway Elementary was closed when two other schools were constructed, people petitioned the Edmonds School District to rename the SnoLine Elementary School to Woodway Elementary School. People who lived in the area prior to 1995 when it was annexed into the City of Edmonds have often stated that while their address is in Edmonds, they do not live in Edmonds. He took offense that people who claim they don't live in Edmonds now want to participate in the process of naming the new park. He encouraged the citizens to carefully review the Park Naming Policy and its associated criteria. He noted that one of the criteria specifically states that while serving in public office, public officials should not be considered candidates for park names. He noted that Lora Petso has served on the City Council and she has announced plans to run again.

Board Member Clarke suggested it would be difficult to choose between the numerous nominations that were related to the Sherwood theme. For example, Robin Hood Lanes is located in Westgate and Friar Tuck Restaurant is in the bowling alley. However, neither of them are in the Sherwood Neighborhood. He suggested Firdale Village is as much identified with this area as Sherwood Forest, and so is Forest Glen. There is a huge population of neighborhoods with these types of names, and for this reason, he felt it would be best to name the park after a concept of service and an individual who lives in the area.

He noted that Dr. Hickman's address is Edmonds, Washington, and when he tells people where he lives, it is in Edmonds. His children attended school at Woodway Elementary and Dr. Hickman and his wife, Lucille, were co-presidents of the PTA for a while.

Board Member Clarke observed that people in the cancer or kidney community know and revere the name Hickman without even knowing Dr. Hickman. The Hickman Catheter is a life-saving, quality-of-life medical device, and the spirit behind it has been well recognized. He noted the many letters of support the Board received for naming the park after Dr. Hickman, yet there were few letters in support of the other nominations. While he appreciates the citizen comments, he noted that many of them did not address the criteria outlined in the Park Naming Policy, which are very specific and provide opportunities to name parks after events and individuals. There is nothing in the criteria that says the individual must live in Edmonds. He specifically noted that Criteria F states that the quality of the contribution should be considered along with the length of service and that the person making the recommendation should fully substantiate the individual's contribution. He reviewed that Dr. and Mrs. Hickman are in their 80's, and they have been proved and tempered throughout their life. He does not think Dr. Hickman's name would ever bring tarnish to the park, the citizens or the community.

Board Member Stewart thanked the citizens for participating in the hearing. She noted that the Board is new to the responsibility of participating in the park naming process. She said she does not live in the neighborhood adjacent to the park, so she does not understand the dynamics associated with the park. She recalled the subcommittee struggled with the names of all of the surrounding neighborhoods and wanted to be fair. They suggested the name "South Edmonds Community Park because it seemed to reflect the community, which is what the park is really about. The subcommittee considered the fact that there were a lot of Robin Hood Themed names, but there was a consensus that it may not be a good idea for another themed name, particularly because of the history related to political correctness. She said she appreciates Board Member Clarke's comments and observations from living in the area for a long time.

Board Member Reed explained that when the subcommittee met to review the list of names and narrow it down to three, they also discussed the idea of recommending some type of plaque to recognize the community group that worked so hard to get the park established. He noted that one suggested name was J.P. Patches. Although the subcommittee ultimately decided not to recommend that name for the park, as a whole, they felt it would be appropriate to place a plaque or sign in the children's play area to acknowledge his contribution to children. They also discussed the contributions of Police Chief David Stern, and they suggested the City consider recognizing him in connection with the public safety complex. He noted that South Edmonds Community Park was not one of the nominated names, but South East Family Park was. The subcommittee felt "family" would too narrowly define what the use of the park would be, so they created the name South Edmonds Community Park. The subcommittee also discussed that Cherry Blossom Park could be an appropriate name given the substantial community effort to save the large cherry tree on the park site.

Board Member Reed agreed with Board Member Clarke that Hickman Park would be an appropriate name for the park, and it doesn't really matter whether or not Dr. Hickman lives in Edmonds.

BOARD MEMBER CLARKE MOVED THE PLANNING BOARD RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR FINAL ADOPTION THE PERMANENT PARK NAME OF HICKMAN PARK, FOR THE NEW PARK LOCATED AT THE SITE OF THE OLD WOODWAY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, AND THE PLAY AREA LOCATED AT THE NORTHEAST PORTION OF THE PARK BE NAMED J.P. PATCHES PLAY AREA. BOARD MEMBER GUENTHER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Board Member Clarke recalled that J. P. Patches was the Grand Marshall for the Edmonds 4th of July Parade this past year. He noted that Mr. Patches has been recognized throughout the United States for his creative children's program that began in 1958 on KIRO Television. The show was on the air until 1981. Mr. Patches lived in unincorporated Snohomish County south of the park, and he always called Edmonds is home. However, he didn't become a resident of Edmonds until 1995 when his neighborhood was annexed. He still works in the community, and he particularly loves Children's Hospital. He has been a public servant who has dedicated his life to making others smile. He encouraged the Board Members to visit his website to learn more about his life. He was recognized by the City of Seattle as the Man of the Year and in the Fremont Community with a statue. He suggested it would be appropriate that the play area, which is designed to bring joy and laughter to families, be named after J.P. Patches in recognition of his life of service.

APPROVED

Board Member Reed suggested it would also be appropriate to forward a copy of the subcommittee's email memorandum in which they narrowed the list of 88 nominations down to 12 and then recommended three for the Board's consideration. The memorandum also provided additional comments such as a plaque to recognize the community for their significant contribution, naming the children's play area after J.P. Patches, and recognizing Police Chief David Stern in connection with the public safety complex.

BOARD MEMBER REED MOVED THAT THE MOTION BE AMENDED TO ALSO FORWARD THE ENTIRE LIST OF NOMINATIONS AND THE EMAIL MEMORANDUM FROM THE SUBCOMITTEE DATED JUNE 24, 2009, TO THE CITY COUNCIL. BOARD MEMBER STEWART SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION WAS APPROVED 5-0-1, WITH VICE CHAIR LOVELL ABSTAINING.

THE MAIN MOTION WAS APPROVED AS AMENDED BY A VOTE OF 5-0-1, WITH VICE CHAIR LOVELL ABSTAINING.

SUSTAINABILITY DISCUSSION: CITY FIBER OPTIC OPPORTUNITIES

Carl Nelson, Chief Information Officer, advised that he has participated on the Community Technology Advisory Committee (CTAC) for the past two years, and they have had frequent discussions regarding the City's future vision for fiber optics. He advised that he recently made a presentation to the Washington Association of Telecommunications Regulators regarding his effort to work with Snohomish County and neighboring cities to purchase fiber optic cable to connect cities with Snohomish County and each other. He advised that the ability to connect intergovernmental agencies could be revenue positive for the City of Edmonds. He explained that until ten years ago, the City had the ability to resell telecommunications capabilities, but the legislature inadvertently eliminated this option. The City is currently seeking the court's opinion on the City's ability to resell telecommunications capability in areas where the City currently has excess capacity, and the case would be heard sometime in August. He noted that several others cities are also interested in the outcome of the case. He advised that the City has purchased and/or been given fiber optic assets that run from the ferry terminal to Highway 99, south to the County Line and to the Westin Building in downtown Seattle. These assets could have an enormous economic value to the City, depending on the court's determination.

Chair Bowman explained that as part of the Board's discussion regarding sustainability, they are interested in learning more about economically viable ways to generate more revenue for the City. He asked if the City's current fiber optic assets would allow them to attract high tech companies. Vice Chair Lovell reminded the Board that the City Council has asked them to undertake a study and make a formal report in December that includes some specific suggestions and strategies to increase the City's revenue base and improve their long-term economic viability. He invited Mr. Nelson to provide a written document that explains and underscores in clear terms the benefits of the programs he is working to implement. The document should clearly identify the benefits to the tax payers and the City's economy. It should also provide information about how citizens and businesses can learn more about the City's fiber optic assets and their associated costs.

Board Member Reed requested more information about the potential benefits and expenses to the City if they prevail in the court case. Mr. Nelson answered that the City has hired a consultant to work out the numbers, and the City's goal is to leverage their fiber optic assets to their best advantage. In addition, he said he would continue to explore options for several cities in Snohomish County to connect with the County's network room.

Chair Bowman suggested that Mr. Nelson report back to the Board after the court has issued a decision. He said the Board would be interested in learning more about other cities that are in a similar position to leverage fiber optic opportunities as a profit center. He emphasized that the Board has the dual task of addressing both environmental and economic sustainability. He suggested that fiber optics could be one venue that provides a low carbon footprint, but a high return on the City's investment. Mr. Nelson pointed out that other entities in the area (ports, school districts, etc.) have this same type of capability. It is important to get the pipe opened between the various entities so that trades and exchanges can occur. He summarized that the City's current fiber optic capability is not being fully utilized because of existing legislation, and

APPROVED

changes are needed to open these opportunities. However, he emphasized that capacity has increased dramatically over the past five years.

Board Member Stewart asked if it is the City's desire to own the fiber optic pipe. Mr. Nelson said it is important that the City own at least some portion of the pipe. Board Member Stewart observed that the City is spending a lot of money on a court case that many other jurisdictions would benefit from. Mr. Nelson agreed. He noted that Seattle and Bellevue have offered to help pay for an appeal, but the case would not go beyond the scope of the City unless it is challenged in the State Supreme Court. Board Member Stewart stressed the importance of keeping track of all the expenses involved in the court case. It will be important to show the citizens of Edmonds the return on their dollar to explore these options. She said she hopes the return will be substantial enough to really help the City's current financial situation. Mr. Nelson said he foresees a significant benefit to the City in obtaining the capability to resell telecommunications capabilities. The City currently has excess capacity that could be used to generate revenue. He emphasized that intergovernmental cooperation provides an opportunity to avoid some of the costs the City would otherwise incur.

SUSTAINABILITY DISCUSSION: MEETING WITH COMMUNITY TRANSIT ON THEIR PLANNING, OPERATIONS AND PRIORITIES

Roland Behee, Supervisor for Strategic Planning, Community Transit, indicated he was present to provide information about Community Transit's (CT) new rapid transit (SWIFT) program on Highway 99. He distributed a map showing the service that is currently offered throughout the City of Edmonds. He noted that, at this time, ¼ mile is the commonly accepted distance that a person is willing to walk to access bus service. He observed that CT currently offers a significant amount of bus service along Highway 99, with connections to the Edmonds Ferry Terminal, downtown Edmonds and other areas of the community.

Mr. Behee reported that CT is in the final stage of implementing the rapid transit program (SWIFT), and they have conducted numerous public outreach meetings in the community. In addition, they have worked with City staff regarding station locations and names. The SWIFT program would provide a 17-mile long connection between Everett and the Aurora Transit Station in Shoreline, with 24 stations (12 northbound and 12 southbound). The program would utilize the infrastructure investments that already exist along the corridor to provide rapid, frequent, bi-directional service at 10-minute frequencies throughout the majority of the day. The program would provide new 60-foot articulated vehicles, and CT is currently in the process of commissioning the new vehicles and getting them ready for service in the fall.

Mr. Behee provided a drawing to illustrate the design of the new stations and noted that a new station is currently being developed at the intersection of 196th Street and Highway 99. It will include a 10-inch elevated curb, which will provide for nearly level boarding. The stations would provide protection from the weather and outdoor fair collection machines in addition to the smart card readers. Vice Chair Lovell noted that the shelter design identifies a glass roof with a reversed slope and drainage to the center to collect rain water. He observed that it is likely people would toss items onto the roof, and they would become stuck in the gutters. He asked how CT plans to resolve this problem. Mr. Behee answered that the stations would be maintained on a daily basis by CT's internal facilities crew.

Chair Bowman asked if the stations would be handicapped assessable. Mr. Behee replied that the pavement would be marked to show customers with mobility devices where they need to be when the buses stops. The same is true for bicycles. He emphasized that the new stations would provide for much faster loading.

Mr. Behee reviewed that the SWIFT Project is anticipated to cost approximately \$32 million, which equates to about \$1.91 million per mile. In contrast, a rail program would cost between \$200 to 250 million per mile to construct. He noted the project is fully funded by a mixture of local, state and federal dollars. CT would begin testing, training and public outreach programs in the summer of 2009, and they anticipate starting the service in November of 2009.

Mr. Behee referred to the Transit Competitive Index that was prepared by the Puget Sound Regional Council to project regional transit demand for the four county region. As opposed to the I-5 market, which has a strong intercounty peak period market, the Highway 99 market is much more diverse and reflective of the large residential community and mixture of uses

that exist. People travel all day long along the corridor for a mixture of purposes, and a strong market is contained within the Everett market and a southern market comprised of Edmonds, Shoreline and Lynnwood. During the peak periods of time there is strong demand, but the overall pattern during the day is strong to serve the mixture of uses.

Chair Bowman asked how many bus changes would be required if a person were traveling from Everett or north Edmonds to downtown Seattle. Mr. Behee said it would be possible to get from Everett to downtown Seattle using two or three buses, depending on the time of day and final destination.

Mr. Behee referred to a 2008 survey that was conducted to establish a baseline for the origin and destination of people riding buses on Highway 99. He noted that a similar survey would be conducted in 2013 to evaluate the change. He noted that, at this time, there is a real diversity of travel taking place throughout the day on Highway 99. The majority of people using the service on the corridor are walking from their places of residence to catch the bus; it is not really a park and ride market.

Mr. Behee said modeling predicts that ridership would increase 25% in the first year (2010) and 50% by the fourth year (2013). Modeling also predicts that vehicle miles traveled would be reduced 3.2 million in the first year and 7 million by the fourth year.

Chair Bowman inquired if the existing buses on Highway 99 are running at capacity. Mr. Behee said the buses carried approximately 12 million people in 2008. If every seat were filled on every trip, the number would be much larger. Chair Bowman asked if there is significant capacity for additional growth. Mr. Behee replied that while there is additional capacity on an all-day basis, there is very little additional capacity during peak travel times. Many of the runs to King County during peak hours are full and have standing room only. He observed that ridership increased dramatically when gas prices peaked. He explained that their programs are typically designed to meet peak demand, and he acknowledged there is still capacity to grow on many of the local routes.

Board Member Reed requested more information about CT's plan to reduce vehicle miles traveled. Mr. Behee advised that CT has been working with the City of Edmonds Transportation staff to develop a 20-year long-range vision for major corridors such as Highway 99, as well as other primary arterial networks in the City. Future transit emphasis would focus on these areas. They are working to identify future markets for service and are coordinating with the Washington Department of Transportation and local jurisdictions to focus land use and density in certain areas where adequate infrastructure is available to accommodate additional bus service. He noted that 196th Street is a transit-emphasis corridor, and CT is researching opportunities for providing rapid transit service at some point in the future. However, this would be a joint partnership decision between the local jurisdictions and CT. He emphasized that now is the time to start talking about land use planning and preparing the market for this eventuality. He reviewed that the current long-range plan provides the following policy direction:

- Service design guidelines should link transit performance and development practices.
- Guidelines should suggest that corridors/areas that best incorporate transit-oriented community design practices will best support service and service improvement.
- Guidelines should not necessary imply that lower performing corridors will have no service, but priority for new services will be given to areas with the greatest transit trip production.
- Guidelines should emphasis efficient and sustainable service in corridors that produce the most transit ridership.
- Community Transit does not want to assume a regulatory role in land use/development actions but wants to work with and support their partner's regulatory efforts.

Next, Mr. Behee reviewed the draft service design guidelines for the bus rapid transit corridor/station area development as follows:

- About 7,540 persons and jobs within ½ mile of the stations (about 15 persons/jobs per acre).
- Encourage mixed use with a balance of jobs and housing (including low income).
- Work to establish parking market and encourage people to get out of their cars. Consider options for no minimum parking requirement and design parking to be behind or next to businesses rather than in front so pedestrians can get off buses and directly access businesses.

APPROVED

- Provide a complete pedestrian network, particularly through development from residential areas behind frontage, and separation from vehicles.
- Prioritize infrastructure improvements and use existing business access transit lanes, transit signal priority, access consolidation, etc. to allow priority access for buses through the congestion.

Mr. Behee advised that the southern terminal at the Aurora Transit Station would provide crossing platforms once Metro's rapid transit program has been implemented. There could be a common island that allows people to switch from CT to Metro. In addition, CT has supported the City of Shoreline's recommendation that Metro consider moving the transit center to a more central location. From an economic development and ridership perspective, CT believes the station would be better placed near commercial activity or mixed-use development.

Board Member Stewart recalled that at a previous presentation before the City Council, CT mentioned how easy it would be for bikers to board the SWIFT buses. She emphasized the importance of also considering how bikers can better access the bus stations. Mr. Behee said he is a daily bicycle commuter so the SWIFT buses will become his rainy day option. Board Member Stewart said she is excited about the SWIFT Program and if they can tie it in with development along the corridor it would be a win/win situation.

Board Member Clarke recalled Mr. Behee's earlier statement that CT does not want to assume a regulatory role in land use and development actions. However, he asked if CT would recommend higher density multi-family residential zones along major transportation corridors in Edmonds such as 76th Avenue West. Mr. Behee observed that local service is currently provided on 76th Avenue West, and it would provide a good connection to the SWIFT service on Highway 99. However, it has not been identified as a regional transit emphasis corridor. The route would be a local level corridor that would certainly benefit from an increase in density if that was the desire of the City. Community Transit has been very upfront in providing much more individual communication about this type of development on the transit emphasis corridors where they anticipate potential bus rapid transit service at some point in the future. However, he does not want to create the impression that 76th Avenue West would be a good location for a rapid transit corridor.

Board Member Clarke referred to Greenwood Avenue in Seattle and Shoreline and observed that over the past 10 to 20 years the arterial has changed in land use, zoning, building height, and density. Now there is a lot of mixed-use condominium development and many commuters use public transportation. He asked Mr. Behee if there are any areas in Edmonds where this type of evolution could occur if land use and zoning was different. Mr. Behee answered that he does not foresee a rapid transit program on any other streets in Edmonds in the near future beyond Highway 99 and 196th Street. He noted that CT has not provided a connection between 196th Street and the Edmonds Ferry Terminal, and they have left it up to the City to make this decision. The route that connects 196th to the northeast portion of downtown Edmonds would also be a candidate for more intense development. Another corridor that has possibilities is SR 104 coming from the south, which is more of a peak period commuter corridor rather than all day bi-directional service. He emphasized there is a great opportunity for City staff to work with CT staff to identify opportunities for greater density.

Mr. Chave suggested Mr. Behee elaborate on his earlier statement regarding the ¼ mile service radius. Mr. Behee explained that ¼ mile is the generally accepted distance that a person is willing to walk to get to a bus stop. About 50% to 60% of riders have indicated they would be willing to walk ¼ mile, and only 20% to 30% indicated they would be willing to walk 1/3 mile to reach a bus stop. Not very many people indicated their willingness to walk ½ mile to reach a bus stop, but the survey also indicated that frequency and reliability of the service would increase the distance people would be willing to walk. People are typically willing to walk further to get to a service that is more frequent and dependable. Because the SWIFT Program would provide a faster and more reliable service, it would also provide a better sense of place and security for the customers. Community Transit anticipates there would be reasonable redevelopment potential within a ½ mile radius of a rapid transit station.

Chair Bowman invited Mr. Behee to email any data he has on how many gallons of fuel would be saved by taking public transit. Mr. Behee said he could also provide information related to carbon footprint, etc. Mr. Chave requested further documentation on the ¼ versus ½ mile radius.

APPROVED

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

Mr. Chave reviewed that the agenda for the June 22nd meeting would include a public hearing for a rezone application for property in the Five Corners Neighborhood. It would also include an update on the code rewrite project and the Highway 99 Task Force would be present to provide an update on their recent efforts.

The Board agreed to schedule a special work session, perhaps on August 19th or 26th to continue their sustainability discussion. Chair Bowman agreed to email Board Members to identify a specific date for the work session.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

Chair Bowman announced that he would be participating in the STP bike ride again this year.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Board Member Guenther explained that his project in White Salmon is getting to the point where he doesn't have to spend all day Wednesday on site. Therefore, he is able to return early enough to attend the Board meetings. He said he was glad the Board recommended that the new park be named after Dr. Hickman. He expressed his belief that recognizing people for their public service is an appropriate thing to do.

ADJOURNMENT

The Board meeting was adjourned at 9:27 p.m.

APPROVED