

APPROVED MAY 27TH

**CITY OF EDMONDS
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

May 13, 2015

Chair Tibbott 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

Neil Tibbott, Chair
Philip Lovell, Vice Chair
Todd Cloutier
Carreen Rubenkonig
Daniel Robles
Valerie Stewart
Matthew Cheung

STAFF PRESENT

Shane Hope, Development Services Director
Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager
Bertrand Hauss, Transportation Engineer
Renee McRae, Assistant Parks Director

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT

Evan Zhao, Student Representative (excused)

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER CLOUTIER MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF APRIL 22, 2015 BE APPROVED AS AMENDED. BOARD MEMBER STEWART SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS

Mike Echelbarger, Edmonds, expressed his belief that the process used to create the draft Tree Code, which will be the subject of a public hearing before the Planning Board on May 27th, was flawed. The draft Tree Code is heavily influenced by people who like and want to protect trees, and the people who are more interested in sunshine, gardening and views were not represented. Based on the interests of those who participated in the process, it was not difficult to predict the outcome. He recalled that he was present at a previous Planning Board Meeting when the chair of the Tree Board acknowledged that the plan does not address views in Edmonds. He said he used to live in the Town of Woodway, which has a substantial number of trees. The only people who enjoy views are those who live on the bluff. This same thing could happen in Edmonds if the draft Tree Code is implemented as currently written. In not too many years, the trees that are planted (3 to 5-inch caliper) will grow to block views. Given that the City is intent on maintaining a 25-foot height limit, he questioned why they would adopt a tree code that requires trees to be planted everywhere.

Mr. Echelbarger summarized his belief that the regulations contained in the draft Tree Code are onerous; and phrases such as “preserving trees to the maximum extent possible” are very troubling. Everyone has a different understanding of what that means, and a future planning staff may interpret the code differently than what is intended today. He asked the Board to

consider forwarding a recommendation to the City Council that a more broad-based committee be formed to review the tree code issue. He voiced concern that the code, as currently written, would be impossible to enforce. He noted that Snohomish County adopted a similar code that lasted less than two years because it had so many problems.

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIRECTOR REPORT TO PLANNING BOARD

Ms. Hope referred the Board to her written report and invited them to ask questions and provide comments.

Vice Chair Lovell referred to the bulleted list of items that will be addressed as part of the Major Development Code Update and asked if “design review” would include design standards. Ms. Hope answered affirmatively and added that the update would also clarify the design review process where needed.

Chair Tibbott referred to the changes the City is making to keep up with development activities and asked if staff has considered how extending the turnaround time for permit review would impact developers. He also asked if staff has seen a drop in the quality of the permit reviews as a result of having a very full schedule. Ms. Hope said her goal is to have all of the plans and permits reviewed as quickly as possible, while still maintaining the quality of each review. Right now, people get frustrated and upset when the City is unable to meet the target dates. The idea is to make the target dates more consistent with what they are able to do right now. The changes are intended to be interim to allow staff to catch up with the work load.

Chair Tibbott asked if staff has received complaints from developers because of delays in permit review. Ms. Hope acknowledged there have been numerous complaints about target dates being missed. Although the target dates are not meant to be absolutely deadlines, people have a certain expectation that their permits will be processed within that timeframe. Staff believes that changing the target dates will help keep the expectations more reasonable and there will be fewer complaints if people know what to expect up front.

Chair Tibbott asked how the extended target dates would impact developers financially. Ms. Hope answered that the impact depends on where developers are in the process and whether or not they are truly ready to move forward with a project. She acknowledged that, in some cases, extending the target dates could have an impact.

Board Member Stewart recalled attending a meeting at the City of Issaquah where their Director of Development Services proposed a plan that imposes an additional fee for developers who were interested in an expedited process. The additional fee would allow the City of Issaquah to hire additional people to service the expedited permits. She suggested that the City consider this option, as well. She also suggested the City consider offering an expedited permit process for “green” building projects. Ms. Hope said she is familiar with the concept of expedited permit review, which can work under certain circumstances. The fee is typically higher because it requires a city to contract with a consultant to move the review along more quickly. The concern is that it takes some time for the consultants to become familiar with the city’s codes. Another option is to prioritize projects, and those with a higher priority could be expedited without an additional fee. Her hope is that something related to “green” development could be incorporated into the code as part of the major update.

Vice Chair Lovell stressed the importance of keeping a close watch and notifying the City Council if additional staff is needed to adequately process permits. Ms. Hope recalled that in recent years, the number of planning staff was reduced. The interim change to the target dates will allow time to figure out if the surge in applications is temporary or if the trend is likely to continue, in which case she expects to bring the issue up to the City Council.

Vice Chair Lovell said he finds the Development Services Director Reports to be helpful and informative, not just to the Planning Board, but to the City Council and citizens. Ms. Hope advised that staff is working to prepare a Development Activity and Project Report, which will be presented at the next City Council Meeting. The report will also be presented to the Planning Board as soon as possible.

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATION ON DRAFT CAPITAL FACILITIES ELEMENT

Mr. Chave advised that, with the exception of adding performance measures, no changes were made to the draft Capital Facilities Element (Attachment 1) since the Planning Board last reviewed it. He explained that the proposed performance measures were developed with the assistance of the Public Works Director. As proposed, project deliveries or the results of

capital projects would be compared to what the planned project was. Not only would this give performance feedback, but it could potentially improve project planning in the future. He noted that the list of Capital Facilities Projects (CFP) for 2015-2020 (Attachment 3) was also included for the Commission's information. He emphasized that the CFP was previously approved by the City Council in late 2014 as part of the budget process. The CFP will be carried forward with the Capital Facilities Element and the list will be updated on an annual basis.

Vice Chair Lovell noted that the projects in the CFP fall into three categories (parks, transportation and stormwater), and each project identifies a timeframe for potential funding. He asked if the funding timeframe was coordinated with the Transportation, Parks and Stormwater Elements. He also asked if there is a process in place to prioritize the projects based on the Strategic Action Plan (SAP) that was adopted by the City Council. Mr. Chave explained that the SAP is geared towards bridging the gap between annual budgeting and the City's long-term goals and projects. The SAP is more equivalent to the CFP, which has a six-year timeframe. The CFP was developed with input from various plans (transportation, stormwater, parks, etc.), as well as coordination with the priorities called out in the SAP. He advised that the City's Transportation Engineer could provide more information about how the transportation projects and priorities were identified.

Vice Chair Lovell said he understands that a lot of work is being done to track progress with respect to the SAP. A project leader has been identified for each of the action items in the SAP, and it is likely that the leader will be tracking progress and making sure the projects are identified in the Comprehensive Plan as appropriate. Mr. Chave clarified that while the SAP may identify a few priorities, it is usually not as project specific as the CFP. Capital budgets and planning must reflect reality (available funding, grant cycles, etc.), and it requires a balancing act in terms of timing. The six-year CFP provides an estimate of the timing of projects, but the timing can be adjusted, particularly if an unanticipated funding source becomes available. That is why the projects are shuffled around each year when the list is updated. The list is intended to be a guide, but not a rigid program.

Mr. Chave asked that the Planning Board review the Capital Facilities Element, make appropriate adjustments, and forward it to the City Council for review. He noted that the Planning Board would have another opportunity to review the element later when all of the Comprehensive Plan Elements are presented to them for a public hearing and recommendation.

Chair Tibbott observed that, typically, staff has identified just one performance measure for each of the Comprehensive Plan Elements that have been presented to the Board to date. However, staff is recommending two performance measures for the Capital Facilities Element. Board Member Cloutier noted that the performance measure is separated into "transportation" and "parks."

Board Member Stewart said she assumes this discussion is related only to the Capital Facilities Element, which includes the CFP going out to a six-year horizon. She observed that six years will go by quickly, and things will change rapidly during that time period. She voiced concern that Edmonds keep up with the trends in neighboring jurisdiction, particularly relative to Level of Service (LOS) Standards. In her research relative to LOS, she came across a website called *STREET BLOG SAN FRANCISCO*, which presents a very provocative argument against the conventional LOS standard that has been used since the middle of the 20th Century. The website explains that LOS is a very simple and blunt metric for understanding the speed that vehicles can move about the City and it measures the amount of vehicular delay at intersections. It suggests that the result of relying on this poor methodology to shape the growth of cities has a profound effect on the politics of human mobility, privileging the movement of vehicles before anything else. She referred to a study that was done by the consulting firm, Nelson Nygaard, which states that, in their practice, the single greatest promoter of sprawl and the single greatest obstacle to transit-oriented and infill development is the transportation analysis convention called LOS. She agreed to provide information to the Planning Board Members and others who are writing the Transportation Element. She hopes that the element can be phrased in such a way to look not only at conventional LOS, but the number of trips generated. She recognized that they are quite far in the process, and she asked that staff at least advise the City Council of the information she can provide.

Board Member Stewart stressed the importance of the City being forward thinking. The trends are clear and people, especially the younger generation, want to be able to walk to amenities and not use a car to get around. They value pedestrian and bicycle access and public transportation. When a proposal is forwarded to the City Council, it needs to take into consideration all modes of transportation.

VICE CHAIR LOVELL MOVED THAT THE BOARD FORWARD THE DRAFT CAPITAL FACILITIES ELEMENT OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR REVIEW, WITH THE SUGGESTION THAT THE THINKING ON SOME OF THE SPECIFIC ELEMENTS BE CAREFULLY REVIEWED WITH RESPECT TO PRIORITIES SET FORTH WITHIN THE SAP. BOARD MEMBER CLOUTIER SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Vice Chair Lovell clarified that the Capital Facilities Element includes the CFP, which identifies transportation, stormwater and park projects. The Capital Facilities Element is separate from the Parks, Stormwater and Transportation Elements of the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Chave further clarified that the CFP will be imbedded in the Capital Facilities Element that is forwarded to the City Council for review. However, it is important to note that the CFP has already been adopted.

DISCUSSION ON DRAFT 2015 TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

Mr. Hauss reviewed that the City has been working with the consultant (Fehr and Peers) on updating the Transportation Plan since October of 2014, and the project is scheduled to be completed in June 2015. The consultant provided an update on the City's transportation related goals and policies on February 11th and the project list on April 8th. The goals and policies and project list were also presented to the City Council. Comments from both the City Council and the Planning Board have been incorporated into the draft Transportation Plan (Attachment 3), which will be the subject of tonight's discussion. He explained that the draft Transportation Plan consists of the goals and policies; an inventory of the existing transportation network and improvements; and project prioritization, costs, projected revenue and implementation strategies. He referred to Appendix A, which is a comparison table that illustrates the modifications that have been made to the draft plan to date.

Don Samdahl, Fehr and Peers, Seattle, noted that the Staff Report provides a written response to each of the questions raised by the Board at previous meetings relative to the goals and policies and project list. He noted that the Transportation Committee has reviewed the draft Transportation Plan and provided comments, as well. In addition, to the responses provided in the Staff Report, Mr. Samdahl addressed the following Board concerns:

- A question was asked about whether or not the current construction projects taking place within the Lynnwood portion Highway 99 would have an impact on the projected Level of Service (LOS) at Edmonds intersections. He explained that the roadway network in Lynnwood was included as part of the travel model, but they did not consider each of the projects in detail. The Lynnwood improvements are located close to a mile away from Edmonds, and he believes there would be minimal impact to the intersections in Edmonds and the proposed recommendations for improvements.
- It was suggested that the Transportation Plan include a detailed definition of "non-motorized transportation.". He recalled the Board's previous discussion about motorized and non-motorized vehicles. He said he had meant to include a definition for a non-motorized vehicle, but he forgot. It would be included in future drafts. In addition, the section of the plan that talks about non-motorized improvements would include a reference to the definition.

Board Member Robles said the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) defines a non-motorized vehicle as something without a motor whatsoever; something that is human powered. While Policies 1.5 and 6.22 are consistent with the City's goals, they define a non-motorized vehicle as including things that are electric. The WAC provides an even more onerous definition for electric-assisted bicycles, which allows them in bike lanes, but not on sidewalks. This sets the City up for problems where bike lanes go onto the sidewalk, such as at Five Corners. He suggested that the Transportation Plan use definitions that are consistent with those found in the WAC.

- Policy 4.3 identifies certain priorities for walkways on collector streets, and there are similar priorities for walkways on arterial streets in Policy 4.2. A question was raised about whether or not it is necessary to retain Policy 4.3. As currently written, the policy sets a hierarchy for sidewalks for transit, schools and retail. After talking with Mr. Hauss, it was agreed that the wording in Policy 4.3 should be changed to implement walkway improvements on collector streets as funding permits to provide access to transit, retail, schools, etc. rather than setting distinct priorities.

Chair Tibbott asked how changing the wording of Policy 4.3 would impact the prioritization of walkway projects. Mr. Samdahl answered that the change would not impact the prioritization of walkway projects, since all of the proposed walkway improvements are on arterial rather than collector streets. Walkway projects on collector streets would be

considered lower priorities as funding is available. He reminded the Board that frontage improvements are required for development that occurs on collector streets, which is consistent with the City's goal of having sidewalks along all streets as funding and timing permits.

Board Member Cloutier recalled that the Board previously discussed the criteria that were used to rank sidewalk projects. He said he supports the methodology and wants to make sure it is clearly explained in the Transportation Plan. Mr. Samdahl said the goal was to match the policies with the specific criteria, and the walkway scoring sheets are included in the appendices.

Mr. Samdahl recalled that a project list was previously presented to the Board, but no funding sources or project costs were identified. The purpose of tonight's presentation is to provide information about projected revenue and estimated project costs. He reviewed that the total cost of implementing all of the identified roadway, bicycle, pedestrian, and preservation and maintenance projects is about \$133 million over the next 21 years, or more than \$6 million per year. He noted that the plan gives emphasis to pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and the intent is that greater weight be given to these facilities when the CFP is updated.

Mr. Samdahl provided a table that was prepared by the Finance Consultant to summarize the revenues the City currently has for transportation. The numbers are based on an average of what the City has received over the past few years, taken forward over the next 20 years. The City's current sources for transportation funding are grants, Real Estate Excise Tax (REET) and the general fund. If future revenues are the same as they are today, the City could expect to have about \$60 million over a 20-year period, or about \$3 million per year. As projected costs are about \$133 million, the projected funding would fall \$73 million short of what is needed to implement all of the projects.

Mr. Samdahl reviewed a list of options the City could consider for additional revenue sources, noting that each would require a lot of discussion and City Council action. Estimates were provided for how much revenue could be obtained via each option. The projected revenue if all of the options were implemented is about \$145 million. He summarized that while it is highly unlikely the City would adopt all of the options, the list makes it clear that there are other revenue sources available to the City. He said the list of options was presented to the Transportation Committee for feedback, and they suggested the following options be considered, as well:

- School zone speed cameras, which are used by several jurisdictions.
- Using utility funding to pay for transportation improvements, which the City already does to some extent.
- Allocating a higher percentage of REET funding to transportation.

Board Member Stewart referred to the contingency plan in case of a revenue shortfall, which is outlined on Page 4-12 of the draft plan. She suggested that an additional bullet be added to this section to read, "*Change the Land Use element in the Comprehensive Plan to increase infrastructure and safety for bicycles and pedestrians, as well as transportation access to alleviate the need for auto mobility.*"

Board Member Robles voiced support for Board Member Stewart's proposed change. He suggested that one of the big winners of the draft plan will be electric-assisted bicycles because of the hills in the City. People who are not currently riding bikes will be more likely to do so in the future. The changes are coming fast, and he emphasized the need to address safety concerns related to this use.

Board Member Robles asked if the consultant would be open to including additional funding ideas on the list provided in the plan, and Mr. Samdahl invited Board Members to share their ideas.

Chair Tibbott asked if maintenance and preservation costs are included in the estimated \$133 million. Mr. Samdahl answered affirmatively and noted that the Table on Pages 4.2 through 4.4 includes an entire section of maintenance and preservation projects, including street overlays. While they are still working to refine the table, approximately \$42 million of the \$133 million has been earmarked for preservation and maintenance, which is a significant increase over the City's current funding level.

Chair Tibbott asked about the current and proposed overlay cycle for collector streets. Mr. Hauss said the City's current overlay cycle is about 60 years. As currently proposed, the plan identifies about \$2 million per year for overlays. The goal is to catch up and increase the annual funding for overlays so the City can get back to a 20 to 30-year cycle. Chair Tibbott suggested it is important to specifically call out and emphasize the importance of this goal in the plan. The City has deferred street maintenance for several years without a clear plan for getting back to a 20 to 30-year cycle.

Vice Chair Lovell asked how a 20 to 30-year overlay cycle would compare with the industry standard. Mr. House answered that normal practice is a 20-year cycle for arterials and a 30-year cycle for collectors. He emphasized that, even with the additional funding identified in the plan, it would take the City a while to catch up. Vice Chair Lovell observed that there is currently a lot of commentary amongst the public in support of street improvements, overlays and sidewalks. When you consider that the standard overlay cycle is 20 to 30 years and the City is currently at 60 years, it is clear that more revenue is needed. At some point, the City needs to ask serious questions of the taxpayers to see if they are willing to pay for the infrastructure improvements. At the current funding level, the City is unable to meet the demands and desires of the residents. He said it is important to emphasize the City's current overlay cycle and the need for significant improvement. The City Council and the public must understand that if roads are left unmaintained for too long, they will have to be rebuilt rather than simply overlaid.

Board Member Stewart pointed out that the projected project costs are based on current technology and materials. She hopes that a caveat will be included somewhere in the document to explain that new technology and materials, as they emerge, can increase the sustainability of the overlays.

Chair Tibbott asked to what extent grant funding factors into the transportation revenue. Mr. Samdahl referred to the information provided earlier, which identifies \$18.5 million in grant funding over the next 20 years. Chair Tibbott noted that this figure assumes that grant funding would continue at close to the same rate as what the City has experienced for the past several years. He asked if the City could expect additional grant funding to help cover the short fall. Mr. Hauss acknowledged there may be additional opportunities. He explained that anticipated grant funding identified by the Financial Consultant was calculated by averaging the amount of grant funding the City has received over the past five or six years. He felt the estimate was fairly accurate, but might be somewhat conservative. While many of the projects on the list would be eligible for grant funding, there is strong competition.

Board Member Rubenkönig asked if implementation of a traffic impact mitigation fee would require a developer to pay for roadway improvements. If so, she asked how the City would determine the impact of a development. Mr. Samdahl advised that the City already has a Traffic Impact Mitigation Program in place that includes a fee schedule. The fee schedule can be updated; but based on the current rates and the amount of anticipated growth, the draft plan estimates \$4 million over a 20-year period unless the City decides to increase the rates. He noted that money paid into the Traffic Impact Fee Program could be used for all eligible projects throughout the City. Board Member Rubenkönig asked if required frontage improvements would include sidewalks. Mr. Samdahl answered that frontage improvements typically include curb, gutter and sidewalk.

Board Member Stewart commented that the draft Transportation Plan has shaped up to be an impressive document, and she appreciates the staff and consultant's hard work and analysis. They did a great job of incorporating the comments provided by the City Council, Planning Board and Transportation Committee. However, she suggested that Policy 3.2 (Page 2-4) be changed to read, "*Design streets with the minimum pavement areas needed and utilize innovative and sustainable materials where feasible, to reduce impervious surfaces.*" She also suggested that Policy 3.18 (Page 2-6) should be changed to read, "*Encourage easements that provide pedestrian connections and protect the natural environment.*" She recalled her previous recommendation that the City should encourage pedestrian easements in neighborhoods and educate the citizens about the opportunity. Mr. Samdahl expressed support for the proposed change since it would indicate that the City is seeking new easements rather than just preserving existing ones.

Board Member Stewart requested additional information about what a "chicane" is. Mr. Hauss explained that a chicane is a type of speed control device that causes a driver to change directions slightly rather than traveling straight down a street. He referred to the chicane that is located on 238th Street just east of Highway 99 as an example.

Board Member Stewart asked if there are still bike lockers located at the train station. If so, she suggested that they be identified on the bike facilities map. Mr. Hauss summarized that they are identified on Figure 3-14 (Existing Bicycle

Facilities) as “bike parking,” but they should also be included on Figure 3-15 (Recommended Bicycle Facilities) as “existing bike parking/locker.”

Mr. Samdahl said his firm was actually involved in the work done by San Francisco relative to LOS, and they are also working on a similar effort with the City of Seattle. Until this most recent round of Comprehensive Plan updates, most cities, including Edmonds, have used roadway LOS standards that are based on congestion at intersections. The Puget Sound Regional Council, (PSRC) and the State of Washington have recently provided guidelines that encourage multimodal LOS and the draft plan makes the first step in this direction by including LOS standards for bicycle, pedestrian and transit facilities. The idea is to use the standards as a catalyst to get more focus on other modes of transportation. He acknowledged there are various methods to address multimodal LOS. For example, the approach used by the City of Seattle does not really care about traffic congestion. If a project generates a vehicle trip, the impact must be mitigated. He said he could provide examples of other methods, but many would be difficult to implement at this stage of the plan. He predicted that before the plan is updated again, there will be a lot of discussion about these other methods.

Board Member Cloutier noted that the 2014 California Guidelines were changed to replace LOS with “vehicle miles traveled.” However, Mr. Chave has previously voiced concern that it would be difficult to establish policies for this approach since “vehicle miles traveled” is not really measurable. He asked Mr. Samdahl to share his experience with this approach. Mr. Samdahl said his firm has been involved with trying to implement California’s new rules and he could provide some information. One of the tricks is making sure you know how to calculate vehicle miles traveled. In California, vehicle miles traveled is tied to the requirements for green house gas emissions (vehicle miles traveled and speed). The new policy is causing consternation because cities still need to understand what the congestion is like at intersection. Board Member Cloutier clarified that he is not suggesting the approach as an alternative at this time, but he is interested to know if it is a viable alternative that would make sense for the City in the future.

Chair Tibbott asked to what extent the state and PSRC’s guidelines for multimodal transportation and different approaches to LOS would help the City obtain grant funding for projects. For example, the project on 84th Street would increase accessibility for pedestrians and bicycles and provide a good north/south corridor for the city. However, the estimated project cost is \$20 million, and it is unlikely the City will ever have enough funding to move the project forward unless there are certain priorities that bump it up. Mr. Samdahl answered that specific grants, particularly Congestion, Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) grants, are based on air quality. He said projects could also be more eligible for grant funding if the goal is to reduce the number of vehicle miles traveled and increase the number of bicycle and pedestrian miles traveled. Chair Tibbott asked if adopting a more holistic LOS approach would open the City to additional grant opportunities, and Mr. Hauss answered affirmatively.

Board Member Rubenkönig referred to Figure 3-15 (Recommended Bicycle Facilities) and asked if the sharrow identified on Sunset Avenue is considered permanent or temporary. Mr. House answered that no decision has been made on whether or not it will be made permanent. The intent is to illustrate the existing bicycle facilities, which includes the sharrow on Sunset Avenue. Board Member Rubenkönig suggested that the map should include a disclaimer to make it clear that the sharrows on Sunset Avenue are subject to change and are not considered permanent at this time.

Mr. Samdahl advised that the Board’s comments would be incorporated into the draft plan that is presented to the City Council on May 19th. After hearing a similar presentation, the City Council will conduct a public hearing. The City Council is scheduled to have more discussion about the Transportation Element on May 26th, and an open house on the entire Comprehensive Plan Update, including the Transportation Element, has been scheduled for June 10th. Mr. Hauss invited Board Members to continue to submit written comments to him.

BOARD MEMBER RUBENKONIG LEFT THE MEETING AT 8:30 P.M.

MARINA BEACH PARK MASTER PLAN BRIEFING

Ms. McRae advised that the intent of this discussion is to brief the Board on the activities that have occurred with the Marina Beach Park Master Plan since the last discussion on March 25th. She advised that the staff and consultant presented three options to the City Council on April 7th, and the public was invited to participate in an open house, as well as a virtual open house. In late April, the Project Advisory Committee (PAC) reviewed the three options, taking into consideration the

comments provided by the citizens, City Council and Planning Board. They agreed to eliminate Option A and retain Options B and C for further exploration. Another open house was held on May 6th, where the two remaining options were presented to over 100 attendees. She introduced Chris Jones, from Walker Macy, Ltd, who was present to provide an update on the process and discussion the two remaining options. They are particularly interested in receiving feedback from the Planning Board as they prepare to present the options to the City Council next week.

Chris Jones, Landscape Architect and Principle, Walker Macy, Ltd., reviewed that the Marina Beach Park planning process was advised by the 13-member PAC. It has included a significant public outreach program, including stakeholder meetings and public open houses in March and May. A third open house is scheduled for July. He reviewed that at the Board's March 25th meeting, he presented contextual information and three schemes for the alignment of Willow Creek. These same diagrams were presented to the City Council and PAC for feedback, as well.

Mr. Jones explained that at the most recent open house, attendees were placed in groups and asked to provide feedback on the three alternatives. Much of the feedback was related to Option A, and the most prominent concern was that it would displace the off-leash dog park. In addition to the attendees disinterest in continuing with Option A, there was significant discussion about the importance of preserving the natural resource. The comments received led the PAC to eliminate Option A, but continue on with Options B and C (now Options 1 and 2).

Mr. Jones recalled that the 100-foot buffer requirement was noted when the Board last discussed the options for Marina Beach Park. In subsequent discussions with Planning Division Staff it was determined that the project would be eligible for a buffer reduction of up to 50%, and the 50-foot buffer is illustrated in both Option 1 and Option 2. It would run along both sides of the stream and would be defined as primarily dense plantings to mitigate stormwater impacts to the creek. He provided a brief synopsis of each of the options as follows:

- Option 1 – The off-leash dog park would remain in its current location, but the size would be reduced by about 15% to 20% to accommodate the buffer. This option would maintain the same number of parking spaces as what is currently available, but the parking would be reconfigured and a turnaround would be added to provide a drop-off area for park users. The lawn area would be reconfigured to address the constraints created by the buffer, but the intent is to maintain as much lawn area as possible as per the public's stated desire. An lookout would be provided to maintain the feel of the beach experience on the remainder of the park. As per the community's desire, both options would integrate play opportunities for children into the buffer area along Willow Creek.
- Option 2 – This option is very similar to Option 1. While the number of parking stalls would be maintained, the spaces would be reconfigured and there would be no turnaround. The off-leash dog park would remain in its current location, and a bridge over Willow Creek would be provided to connect the dog park with the remainder of the park. An overlook is proposed where the Unocal Building previously existed. The lawn area would be configured on the north side of the parking area, with another overlook on the extreme north end of the park. Both options would provide a brick and mortar restroom facility to replace the current portable restrooms.

Mr. Jones provided a picture of a creek located at Carkeek Park in Seattle to illustrate what a visitor could experience at Marina Beach Park when Willow Creek is daylighted. Many citizens have expressed concern about what the buffer will be like, and the intent is that the creek will be relatively low-flowing, with flows changing depending on the level of the tide.

Mr. Jones summarized that at the most recent open house there was not clear direction on whether the community was in favor of Option 1 or Option 2, but most of the speakers were against elimination of the dog park, and were glad that Option A was removed from consideration. Some attendees indicated support for the proposed turnaround in Option 1. Some voiced support for the restrooms to be located next to the dog park, and others preferred a more central location. There was concern about parking, but the fears were reduced when it was explained that the required buffer would have an impact on the ability to provide additional parking. The attendees emphasized the importance of replacing the parking stalls consistent with the number of spaces currently available.

Mr. Jones summarized that the third and final public open house is scheduled for the first week in July, and the final alternatives will be presented to the Planning Board and City Council at the end of July.

Vice Chair Lovell asked how many parking stalls would be provided in each of the options. Mr. Jones answered that each option would provide 57 parking stalls. Although he is not a dog owner, Board Member Lovell said he visits the park often. He expressed his belief that Option 1 has a number of advantages over Option 2. For example, the drop-off area is an excellent idea that would solve a number of issues by allowing people who use the park a place to unload. Its proposed location at the end of the bridge would provide a good circulation and distribution point for pedestrians. He said he supports the idea of the restroom being located closer to the park and the turn around. This location would serve not only park users, but walkers who are passing by, without having to go through the entire parking lot. Option 1 also does a good job of isolating the dog park. Some people have commented that they are afraid of dogs and are concerned about the noise and mess they can create. The distinct buffer between the dog park and the rest of the park is not as apparent in Option 2. Lastly, he said the bridge identified in Option 1 might be seen as a negative because it appears to be for the exclusive use of dog park users.

Vice Chair Lovell said he does not find anything particularly attractive about Option 2. Placing the lawn area so close to the marina might present problems with people playing on the riprap even though there would be a fence. Option 1 would obviate that concern. In addition, he expressed concern that the proposed restroom location would be too far from the beach and there would be less opportunity for visual and landscaped screening between the southern section of the park and the dog park. He summarized that Option 1 has far more positive aspects than Option 2.

Board Member Stewart agreed with Vice Chair Lovell's observations. She asked if it would be possible to include the lookout points shown in Option 2 (northwest of the dog park) in Option 1, as well. She said she supports the proposed turnaround in Option 1, as well, as it would allow for drop off of people, equipment, etc. She said the PAC discussed the option of having two bridges across Willow Creek, but it was noted that the bridges are costly and it may be over the top to provide two. A second bridge would be more appropriate in Option 2, given the way that Willow Creek would bisect the park. She noted that the bridge in Option 1 would provide direct access from the parking lot to the dog park, and Mr. Jones added that there would also be passage between the two park sections at the mouth of the creek.

Board Member Stewart pointed out that the buffer is considered part of the Shoreline Jurisdiction and is subject to the Shoreline Master Program (SMP). She recalled previous discussion that the City sets itself up better for grant funding if a 100-foot buffer is provided. She asked if reducing the buffer to 50 feet would reduce the City's funding opportunities. Mr. Jones said he discussed this issue with a representative from the Department of Ecology (DOE) and learned that their water funding program requires a 35-foot buffer based on the way the water body is defined. He felt that a 50-foot buffer would fit within the requirements of this specific program, and none of the other funding programs they looked into have specific buffer requirements.

Vice Chair Lovell referred to the site analysis that was provided in the Staff Report, which references the future Willow Creek Culvert. He pointed out that this culvert already exists and should be labeled appropriately in the site analysis. The way it is currently identified gives the impression that a new culvert will be installed. The Board agreed that it should be identified on the map as an existing culvert to accommodate future Willow Creek daylighting.

Board Member Cheung asked if physical limitations would prevent the walkway from going directly, rather than diagonally, to the dog park, with the bridge located midway. He voiced concern that, as proposed in Option 1, the walkway would present a significant barrier between the dog area and the remainder of the park. Mr. Jones agreed that the bridge, as currently proposed, appears to serve only dog users, which is not the message the City wants to convey. Board Member Stewart recalled that the PAC discussed the need to separate the dog park users from other park users so the two uses do not conflict. She suggested this would be an appropriate subject to invite the public to weigh in on at the next open house.

Board Member Cheung observed that the proposed location of the restroom in Option 1 would require dog park users to walk across the bridge and parking lot, and all the way to the turnaround area. Vice Chair Lovell agreed that is a valid point. He asked if the City has any figures for the number of dog park users compared to other park users. He emphasized that some people are afraid of dogs and do not want to interact with them. Option 1 would separate the two uses and allow people with dogs to go directly to the dog park. Ms. McRae reported that the dog park is heavily used, particularly in the summer. Some estimates indicate that there are about 1,000 dogs per day and about 30,000 doggy bags are used every six weeks in the summer. She said there was some discussion about providing two restrooms at the park, but it was decided it would be cost prohibitive.

Board Member Cloutier pointed out that, oftentimes, people who use the dog park use the street and the back of the marina for parking. Therefore, he felt the proposed bridge location in Option 1 would be appropriate. However, he suggested that the restroom could be moved closer to the bridge so it is more accessible to all users. He also expressed concern that having two separate lawn areas, as shown in Option 2, would be more costly to maintain.

Chair Tibbott asked what types of uses would be permitted within the buffer areas. In addition to natural play ground features, he asked if picnic tables and viewing platforms would be allowed. Mr. Jones answered affirmatively and explained that the intent is not to allow impervious surface within the buffer area. As they start defining the experiences within the buffer area, they could address how the trails would interact with the creek and how the buffer could be protected. He noted that signage could be included as an interpretive element.

Chair Tibbott asked what type of barrier the consultant envisions between the dog park and the creek. Mr. Jones said a fence would be provided on the north side of the dog park to prevent pets from entering the creek buffer. The type of fence is still up for discussion. Chair Tibbott asked to what extent daylighting Willow Creek would help with drainage problems towards the highway. Mr. Jones suggested that this question be directed to Shannon and Wilson or to the City's stormwater engineer.

Board Member Robles asked about the source for Willow Creek, and Mr. Jones said his understanding is that Willow Creek is a natural spring. Board Member Robles said it is obvious that the water quality of the creek is quite high. Mr. Jones said it would be considered a brackish creek from the salt water, and salmon will use it to access the marsh.

Chair Tibbott recalled that Mr. Jones mentioned possible expansion of the existing play area. He asked if the play area would remain in its current location. Mr. Jones said the play structure could be relocated as per Option 1. Board Member Stewart added that there has been some discussion amongst the PAC about having the play area fit into the landscape better. Mr. Jones agreed the structure could be moved to another location in the City and a new structure could be installed that is more compatible with the setting.

Mr. Jones explained that the turnaround shown in Option 1 has a smaller turning radius than what would be required for fire access. Making the turnaround accessible to a fire truck would require it to be expanded from 60 feet to 100 feet, which would significantly reduce the amount of space available for the park. Chair Tibbott noted that the current turnaround does not accommodate emergency vehicles.

Vice Chair Lovell thanked the staff and consultant for their efforts in the master plan process, particularly noting the numerous opportunities for public involvement.

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

Chair Tibbott announced that a public hearing on the draft Tree Code is scheduled for May 27th. He asked that it be placed as the first item on the agenda. He said a public hearing on the Comprehensive Plan Update is scheduled for June 10th, and the Planning Board's retreat is scheduled for June 24th. He explained that the retreat will include a discussion with Verdant Health Care and hospital representatives regarding their plans for the medical zone. He invited the Board Members to forward additional ideas for the retreat agenda to him as soon as possible.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

Chair Tibbott reported that he and Vice Chair Lovell attended a recent Puget Sound Regional Council meeting where they sat at a table with an Edmonds City Council Member and heard several presentations. The main item of discussion was related to plans for light rail. There was a lot of interest and comment about the golf tournament in Pierce County, as well.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Board Member Cheung said he is excited about the public hearing on the draft Tree Code that is scheduled for the next meeting. He said the draft code has spurred some intense conversation, and he has heard comments from a number of people. Board Member Cloutier said most of the comments he has received have been in opposition to the proposed code.

Board Member Cloutier thanked the public for attending the open houses for the Marina Beach Park Master Plan. Their comments helped to clarify the issues, and a similar process might be helpful for the draft Tree Code, as well.

Vice Chair Lovell suggested that after the public hearing on the draft Tree Code, the Board should summarize the main messages they heard from the public. He said he is particularly interested in seeing how much participation there is at the hearing. Quite often, the public does not get involved at the Planning Board level. Instead, they wait until a recommendation has been sent to the City Council.

Board Member Robles said he is worried about polarization between the “shaders” and “shiners.” The shaders do not necessarily want sunshine and the shiners do not necessarily want shade. However, the two should not be considered to be mutually exclusive. Both needs must be considered.

Board Member Stewart referenced a recent article in *THE SEATTLE TIMES* about why people push to live where they do. The theme of the article was that lifestyle trumps affordability. People want to be close to public amenities and transportation, as well as good pedestrian and bicycle access. They are often willing to pay a larger share of their income for housing in order to live in these situations.

ADJOURNMENT

The Board meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.