

EDMONDS CITY COUNCIL APPROVED MINUTES

November 25, 2014

The Edmonds City Council meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Mayor Earling in the Council Chambers, 250 5th Avenue North, Edmonds.

ELECTED OFFICIALS PRESENT

Dave Earling, Mayor
Diane Buckshnis, Council President
Kristiana Johnson, Councilmember
Lora Petso, Councilmember
Strom Peterson, Councilmember
Joan Bloom, Councilmember
Thomas Mesaros, Councilmember (arrived 6:59 p.m.)

ELECTED OFFICIALS ABSENT

Adrienne Fraley-Monillas, Councilmember

ALSO PRESENT

Noushyal Eslami, Student Representative

STAFF PRESENT

Al Compaan, Police Chief
Phil Williams, Public Works Director
Carrie Hite, Parks & Recreation Director
Scott James, Finance Director
Shane Hope, Development Services Director
Rob English, City Engineer
Deb Sharp, Accountant
Jeff Taraday, City Attorney
Linda Hynd, Deputy City Clerk
Jerrie Bevington, Camera Operator
Jeannie Dines, Recorder

1. CONVENE IN EXECUTIVE SESSION REGARDING POTENTIAL LITIGATION PER RCW 42.30.110(1)(i)

At 6:30 p.m., Mayor Earling announced that the City Council would meet in executive session regarding potential litigation per RCW 42.30.110(1)(i). He stated that the executive session was scheduled to last approximately 10 minutes and would be held in the Jury Meeting Room, located in the Public Safety Complex. No action was anticipated to occur as a result of meeting in executive session. Elected officials present at the executive session were: Mayor Earling, and Councilmembers Johnson, Buckshnis, Peterson, Petso, and Bloom. Others present were City Attorney Jeff Taraday, Parks & Recreation/Human Resources Reporting Director Carrie Hite and Deputy City Clerk Linda Hynd. The executive session concluded at 6:40 p.m.

2. MEET WITH CANDIDATES PEGGY IRWIN SORAICH AND JOAN LONGSTAFF FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE CEMETERY BOARD

Following the executive session, the City Council met with Peggy Irwin Soraich and Joan Logstaff, candidates for appointment to the Cemetery Board. The meeting took place in the Jury Meeting Room, located in the Public Safety Complex. Elected officials present were: Mayor Earling, and Councilmembers Johnson, Buckshnis, Peterson, Petso, and Bloom.

Mayor Earling reconvened the regular City Council meeting at 7:00 p.m. and led the flag salute.

3. ROLL CALL

Mayor Earling relayed Councilmember Fraley-Monillas would not be present tonight; she was spending time with a very ill relative.

Deputy City Clerk Linda Hynd called the roll. All elected officials were present with the exception of Councilmember Fraley-Monillas.

4. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

COUNCIL PRESIDENT BUCKSHNIS MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER PETERSON, TO APPROVE THE AGENDA IN CONTENT AND ORDER. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. **APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS**

COUNCILMEMBER PETERSON MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCIL PRESIDENT BUCKSHNIS, TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA. MOTION CARRIED (6-0-1), COUNCILMEMBER MESAROS ABSTAINED. The agenda items approved are as follows:

A. **APPROVAL OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 18, 2014**

B. **APPROVAL OF CLAIM CHECKS #211553 THROUGH #211670 DATED NOVEMBER 20, 2014 FOR \$835,009.31 (REISSUED CHECK #211583 \$33.75). APPROVAL OF PAYROLL DIRECT DEPOSIT AND CHECKS #61283 THROUGH #61292 AND #61382 FOR \$467,030.85, BENEFIT CHECKS #61293 THROUGH #61298 AND WIRE PAYMENTS OF \$447,898.00 FOR THE PAY PERIOD NOVEMBER 1, 2014 TO NOVEMBER 15, 2014. APPROVAL OF PAYMENTS FOR HOLIDAY BUY BACK (CHECK #61299 THROUGH #61348) FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT COMMISSIONED EMPLOYEES AND LAW ENFORCEMENT SUPPORT SERVICE EMPLOYEES IN THE AMOUNT OF \$125,150.61 AND KELLY BUY BACK (CHECK #61349 THROUGH #61381) FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT COMMISSIONED EMPLOYEES IN THE AMOUNT OF \$36,909.77 PER UNION CONTRACTS**

C. **APPROVAL TO SURPLUS COMPUTER EQUIPMENT**

D. **CONFIRMATION OF PEGGY IRWIN SORAICH AND JOAN LONGSTAFF TO THE CEMETERY BOARD IN POSITIONS #3 AND #4**

E. **OCTOBER 2014 BUDGETARY FINANCIAL REPORT**

6. **AUDIENCE COMMENTS**

Carla Elder, Edmonds, added her voice to the comments regarding Sunset Avenue: she really, really hates it. She referred to the one year evaluation period and asked on what basis a decision would be made to keep or change the configuration. She stated Sunset Avenue has been turned into a little, narrow claustrophobic street whereas before it was very spacious and open. Now when parking to enjoy the view it feels like you are parked in the middle of the street and the angle parking creates a narrow choke point. She summarized the charm of the street has been changed. Mayor Earling suggested she contact Public Works Director Phil Williams.

Kurt Greiner, Edmonds, stated the analysis he conducted to determine where the southern slope started differed from Tetra Tech's analysis. He later revised his analysis and provided the Council his revised report; Tetra Tech used a slope of 1.5% and he used a slope of 1.2%, not accounting for the change in elevation of the land south to north. To the comments that the City should move forward with one plan,

he agreed that was best way but to do so would require evaluation of all the alternatives. He has not seen some of alternatives that have been referred to such as Edmonds Crossing light, Edmonds Crossing with emergency access, a tunnel under the tracks at Main also referred to as a cut and cover, Main street overpass, Dayton street overpass, emergency access from Pt Roberts or a Bell Street overpass. He suggested before a peer evaluation is done, the public should be informed of the cost of each alternative and benefits each provides.

Charles Gold, Edmonds, explained he presented the Edmonds train trench proposal on July 12, 2012 and he and his wife, Katherine, created the website Edmondstraintrench.net. The public response to a petition on the website for a study led to the City hiring Tetra Tech to do a preliminary study. Tetra Tech, although a respected engineering firm, made major errors in their preliminary study due to their lack of experience in below water level train trench construction and the \$10,000 funding. Foremost the measurement of grade that is not the correct railroad method of percentage, that is 1 foot per 100 = 1%, a calculation essential to BSNF's acceptance. The distance between the north end of the Willow Creek structure and the south edge of Dayton, 2500 feet (+/- 20 feet), is perfect for a 1% grade to provide the required 24.5 foot clearance from the top of the rails to the bottom of the bridge and further space can be gained by ramping up Dayton crossing modestly. He cited expensive changes Tetra Tech made to the initial design such as extending the trench further south near the steep slope at Pt. Edwards and the destruction and rebuilding of the Willow Creek daylighting facility, all the result of the mis-measurement. He referred to several emails they received questioning the destruction of the marsh when the trench is the only plan offered that will clean up the marsh by preventing further contamination of soil under the tracks and runoff. Anthony's restaurant recently signed their petition and they have not yet canvassed downtown businesses that would be severely impacted by a proposed alternative. He requested Tetra Tech publicly correct their study and its unsupported cost estimates and for the City to do same. The Reno trench went from design to operation in four years, a below water level train trench that goes through a much larger city with far more infrastructure relocations, 11 larger bridges versus the 2 smaller ones in Edmonds, curves and is 2.2 miles long.

Katherine Gold, Edmonds, ceded her time. Mr. Gold continued, the fixed price bid for the Reno train trench was \$1.73 million 10 years ago and there has been little inflation since. The railroad right-of-way in Edmonds was a minimum of 70 feet wide and the double tracked Reno trench was 33 feet wide including the Amtrak station. Edmonds' straight 1.2 mile long trench with 467 yards of full depth, 2 simple short flyover bridges and one of the planned tracks has yet to be built so it does not need to be demolished. The Edmonds trench is deeper under the waterline, an engineering calculation addressed in the Tetra Tech study. Single solution studies have been done in Edmonds and rejected for over 20 years including Edmonds Crossing and Edmonds Crossing light which WSF cannot afford. Edmonds is a ferry town; moving traffic to bypass downtown and beaches will be detrimental as many people are introduced to Edmonds from the ferry. No other solution addresses both the Dayton and Main intersections. On behalf of the citizens of Edmonds Mr. Gold requested a properly funded study by Jacobs Engineering to show a real plan and the City's seriousness to potential funding partners; Tetra Tech recommends a full design study to quantify myriad variables. The plan that does the most good for the least should be the one studied followed by the required WSDOT NEPA studies.

Roger Hertrich, Edmonds, asked to whom all the information regarding how to address train traffic would be presented. He understood Mayor Earling planned to contact someone at BNSF regarding the trench; he asked who Mayor Earling has found to talk to, suggesting possibly citizens should contact Warren Buffet. With regard to transparency and public involvement, he recalled some time ago Fire District 1 presented the City a huge bill. That bill has been discussed in executive session but there has not been a good discussion during a public meeting about whether the City plans to pay the bill, negotiate with Fire District 1, etc. to protect citizens' tax money. He suggested the City may need to discuss the pros/cons of starting its own fire department again.

Dave Page, Edmonds, referred to the information provided by Mr. Gold three weeks ago, commenting it reminded him of when the Port proposed their plan to develop Harbor Square; his first thought was they don't have the votes, it won't happen. He questioned whether the City would get the \$300 million referred to by Mr. Gold for a train trench., noting if the cost was \$200 million now, it would be \$300 million by the time it was built. Although he was very interested in the topic as a taxpayer and would be as involved as he could, he wanted to see all the alternatives. During the last election there was a great deal of discussion about transparency in government; after the election that seems to have gone by the wayside. He expressed concern with the number of executive sessions and suggested many of the things discussed could and should be open to the public months/years later.

Councilmember Bloom read a letter from **Thalia Moutsanides, Edmonds**, suggesting a compromise on the Sunset Avenue project. She envisioned a 3-foot walkway instead of the grant-driven project could have been accomplished without all the upheaval. She has heard the project must be kept or the City will have to pay the money back; the project should not be constructed if it does not work. A 3-foot walkway would have allowed people to walk on the west side and retain the parking along the street. She questioned a design with parking on the south end where it looks like a parking lot; eliminating the view for people driving on the street who now have to worrying about being hit, the east sidewalk is dangerous and there are many near misses. Regardless of width, the sidewalk cannot accommodate walkers, people with 1-3 dogs on leashes, bicycles, strollers, elderly, handicapped, Segways, wheelchairs, and scooters. During busy times, people spill into the street on both the west and east sidewalks as cars fly by. She recommended the sidewalk be retained for walkers with or without dogs, strollers and wheelchairs. When garbage trucks are present, cars weave across the street to get around them and cars occasionally drive on the trial sidewalk to get around cars or trucks. People drive down the middle of the street only to realize there are two parked cars at the north end and swerve to avoid them. She suggested the Council and community compromise, make the street work for everyone and not focus on how much money needs to be paid back.

7. **AUTHORIZATION FOR MAYOR TO SIGN SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT WITH DAVID EVANS & ASSOCIATES FOR THE 76TH AVE. W @ 212TH ST. SW INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT**

City Engineer Rob English explained Supplement #5 includes 3 tasks, 1) traffic analysis and conceptual design for moving the Edmonds-Woodway High School drop-off entrance from 76th to 216th, 2) additional geotechnical borings for two detention values and a sewer line, and 3) adding the conversion of overhead utilities to underground. The approximately cost of the supplement is \$69,000 and will be paid by the 112 Fund, the grant and the utilities fund since the borings are being done for the stormwater detention vault and the sewer line.

With regard to the conversion of the overhead utilities, Mr. English explained in preliminary discussions with PUD and Frontier, both are taking a different approach than they did at Five Corners. At Five Corners, most of the undergrounding was done on a cost share arrangement where the City did a lot of the work, building the joint utility trench and installing vaults and conduits and communications pulled the conductors which resulted in very little money being exchanged. The initial reaction by PUD and Frontier is the City would owe them money due to the existing Frontier franchise and PUD's policy for undergrounding utilities in the City's right-of-way and RCW language that states the City is responsible for the difference between aerial relocation to an underground conversion. Undergrounding utilities is part of the scope, but he envisioned there will be ongoing discussion regarding that issue and the Council will be kept apprised. The proposed completion date is December 31, 2015. There is a chance the scope for the geotechnical work may be revised; if so, the Council will be informed regard the change as well as any adjustment to the cost.

Councilmember Petso asked about a trial for the new access to Edmonds-Woodway High School parking. Mr. English advised a conceptual layout will be designed by the end of 2015. The project includes changing the lane configuration from the existing four lanes to three lanes. He was uncertain how a trial could be accomplished due to restriping that will be required, etc. The consultant will analyze a 3-lane conversion and evaluate potential queuing as cars enter the parking lot from the south side. He did not anticipate that queue would extend to 76th Avenue.

Councilmember Petso commented it is a student parking lot and located near access to the hospital. She suggested gating the current main entrance for a while and see what happens rather than just evaluating it on paper. If the cost of undergrounding becomes excessive, she asked whether the project would continue without that aspect. Mr. English commented it is always possible that part of the scope would be removed from the project and the utilities would do an aerial relocation.

Councilmember Petso asked whether the City had a franchise agreement with PUD and if not, was this a time to get one in place to avoid this problem in the future. Mr. English responded the City does not have a franchise agreement with PUD. Public Works Director Phil Williams explained the City's franchise agreement with PUD expired in 1967 and has not been replaced. The PUD is citing an internal PUD policy that governs what they will/will not do with regard to relocating poles in the City's rights-of-way. The Five Corners arrangement worked out well but PUD is not as willing to duplicate that same idea on this project. He was hopeful PUD would see the wisdom of doing this project the same way.

Councilmember Petso relayed it was suggested to her that the City was exposed to liability risks without a franchise agreement. Mr. Williams explained the City began discussions with PUD about a franchise agreement when the City was interested in locating fiber optics cable in the communication space on their space on poles; PUD had little or no interest and the issue was dropped. PUD believes they are living up to the bargain in the previous agreement and without an agreement in place, they are guided by their own policy.

Councilmember Johnson suggested negotiations with PUD include the size and dimensions of the cabinets to ensure they were minimal height and width. The cabinets are one of the few criticisms she has heard about the Five Corners roundabout. Mr. Williams agreed it was surprising one of the enclosures at Five Corners was so large. If the size had been known, consideration could have been given minimizing the impact such as additional screening. The only other choice is to put the equipment underground; the cost to underground the two larger enclosures at Five Corners would have been an additional \$300,000.

Council President Buckshnis asked whether there was an amount that would determine that undergrounding would not be done. Mr. English answered the federal funds could potentially be used for utility undergrounding which would factor into the decision. An amount has not yet been determined because the design and cost estimates for the undergrounding has not been completed.

Councilmember Mesaros asked whether undergrounding saved maintenance costs for the utilities. Mr. English answered the City believes so but PUD may have a different answer. Mr. Williams said that point has been brought up with the PUD as well as providing a prorated discount on new utility poles. The PUD discounts those theories in determining what they will pay for. Councilmember Mesaros commented the City to a certain extent was doing the PUD a favor. Mr. Williams answered there is also a safety benefit of undergrounding but that is not PUD's policy.

It was the consensus of the Council to schedule this item on next week's Consent Agenda.

8. INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT FOR JAIL SERVICES WITH THE CITY OF LYNNWOOD

Police Chief Al Compaan recalled several weeks ago he presented two other jail contracts, Snohomish County and Yakima County. Although the Lynnwood Jail is not used as regularly because it is often full with Lynnwood's own prisoners, he felt it is a good contract to continue. The booking fee will remain \$10 which not changed in many years and the daily rate will increase from \$65 to \$85.

Councilmember Mesaros asked how priorities were set with regard to what jail to use. Chief Compaan answered Lynnwood is rarely used because it is usually full with own prisoners. The first priority is Snohomish County Jail, Yakima County is second for longer term incarcerations and Lynnwood is used on somewhat of an ad hoc basis. For example if a person has a warrant and there is also a warrant out of Lynnwood Municipal Court, the prisoner would likely be housed at Lynnwood and Edmonds would pay half the cost of the incarceration.

Councilmember Bloom asked about the \$20/day increase in the daily rate. Chair Compaan answered that is the cost Lynnwood included in the contract; he did not know the basis. There have been increases in past but the daily rate of \$65 has existed for many years. Lynnwood has been very reasonable and a good partner.

It was the consensus of the Council to schedule this item on next week's Consent Agenda.

9. PRESENTATION OF THE TRAIN TRENCH CONCEPT BY TETRA TECH

Mayor Earling explained due to the community's interest in investigating the potential for a train trench, he engaged Tetra Tech for what he viewed as a preliminary look at the engineering challenges and potential cost challenges. It was not meant as a definitive study, certainly not for \$10,000.

Rich Schaefer, Tetra Tech, introduced James Castillo, chief of the structural team in the Bellevue office, and Sandy Glover, who has extensive experience with waterfront transportation projects. Mr. Castillo's team led this study.

Mr. Schaefer reviewed the purpose and scope:

- Identify required footprint and envelope of the Train Trench concept
- Develop technically feasible approach to construct the Train Trench
- Identify associated design, permitting and implementation requirements
- Prepare estimate of direct construction costs and the costs to implement

He described Tetra Tech's Design Team:

- Local experts practicing large-scale civil/structural engineering globally
 - Below-grade train structures
 - Train trench
 - Massive water- and earth-retaining structures
 - State, National and Global award-winning projects

He highlighted Tetra Tech's experience:

- University Street Station
- Pioneer Square Station
- Panama Canal Third Set of Locks Design-Build
- IHNC Lake Borgne Surge Barrier (Louisiana)

Mr. Schaefer reviewed the construction concept, advising the rail track will remain in service during construction. He identified:

- Groundwater elevation

- 6” road surface
- 5’ drilled shaft secant pile wall
- Steel bridge for road crossing
- Bridge abutment
- 25’ minimum height of trench
- 34’ tunnel width plus wall thickness
- 8” structural bottom concrete slab
- 3’ concrete bottom slab

He reviewed the extent of the train trench:

- 7,750 feet long, 34 feet wide
- 30 feet deep from Main to Dayton
- Slope to climb back to grade
- 3,700 feet of trench into groundwater
- Below grade passenger platform
- Steep slopes near Pt. Edwards, Sunset Avenue,
- Regulated shorelines limit footprint and flexibility

He provided an aerial photograph identifying the depth of the trench beginning of the trench, portions below the water table and the end of trench..

Mr. Schaefer provided a diagram illustrating the existing grade, the depth of the train trench, beginning of the trench, proposed Willow Creek Crossing, Dayton Avenue Intersection, Main Street Intersection, and the end of trench. Their concept includes an aggressive 1.5% slope in an effort to shorten the length of the project. Their initial approach would be to see if Willow Creek could be lengthened further south and go under the grade. He commented on his and Ms. Glover’s experience; she was responsible for coordinating work for the Mukilteo multimodal facility and he was the project manager for the conceptual design, permitting and environmental review for Seattle’s Downtown Elliott Bay Seawall Replacement Project. Although the amounts for environmental review, permitting and mitigation may seem large, they are real estimates based on experience.

He reviewed construction conditions that drive costs:

- Depth and length
- Shallow groundwater/saturated soils
- Maintaining and supporting active rails
- Urban setting/confined work space
- Proximity to shorelines and steep slopes
- Extension of the Willow Creek project
- Environmental review/permitting

He commented on differences between the Edmonds train trench and other train trenches cited on the Edmondstraintrench.net website. He provided a cost estimate summary:

Direct Construction	\$136 M
Contingency, 30% - 50%	\$41 M – 68 M
Sales Tax, 9.5%	\$17 M - \$19 M
Construction Subtotal	\$194 M - \$223 M
Management Reserve, 10%	\$19 M - \$22 M
Project Mgmt. & Administration, 3%	\$6 M - \$7 M
Engineering, 12%	\$23 M - \$27 M

Environmental Mitigations	\$4 M
Environmental Review & Permitting	\$5 M
Project Total	\$251 M - \$288 M

Council President Buckshnis commented she is on the WRIA 8 Board; they have spent approximately \$500,000 on the design of Willow Creek daylighting. She relayed her understanding the culverts need to be moved further south. Mr. Schaefer agreed, advising the creek alignment as it is currently designed will go into the side of the trench box. He envisioned the creek would parallel the tracks further south although that raises a question about the cross-section as it approaches the hillside with two rails and the creek adjacent to the bluff. Consideration was given to permitting the construction rigs on rails in the tidelands; that possibility would need to be investigated.

Councilmember Bloom referred to Mr. Schaefer's comment about having a higher bridge crossing at Dayton and Main to reduce depth and asked whether that would provide enough clearance for Willow Creek. Mr. Schaefer did not envision it would unless there was a hump in the streets similar to the bridge in Richmond Beach. There are other things that cross at Dayton such as a storm drain which also could be rerouted as well as the outfall from wastewater treatment plant. Funds were included in the cost estimate to change it from one large pipe to four smaller pipes to provide a thinner profile crossing the tracks and consolidating into one pipe on the west side. He summarized there are a number of engineering approaches to raise the elevation. There have not been any discussions with BNSF with regard to whether these details are acceptable to them.

Councilmember Petso asked whether the trench depth could be less than 30 feet, recalling audience comment that referred to 24 or 25 feet. Mr. Schaefer answered that assumed the road bridges could be crowned. Councilmember Petso relayed her understanding of Mr. Schaefer's explanation that 25 feet was not enough clearance. Mr. Schaefer explained BNSF requires 23.5 feet from the rails to clear space. The bridge would be above that including 4 feet for a bridge deck, 3 foot slab underneath, etc.

Councilmember Petso relayed she has been creating a matrix of options for addressing train issues. She asked whether a trench under Main and not under Dayton would eliminate the problems at the marsh. Mr. Schaefer advised the trench needs to climb up; it would be partially out of the ground at Dayton which would cut off Dayton Street.

With regard to claims made about the trench, Councilmember Petso relayed she has heard it would be helpful to the marsh to keep contaminants out but his presentation indicated it may be detrimental to marsh because mitigation may be required. Mr. Schaefer explained runoff from the tracks washes into the marsh today; a trench would contain that. That runoff would need to be pumped out of the trench and treated prior to discharge either to Puget Sound or the marsh; that cost was included in the cost estimate. Mitigation can take a number of forms and it will depend on the agencies, other stakeholders and the scope of the project during environmental review. Councilmember Petso summarized mitigation is a cost component but can also be a benefit. Mr. Schaefer agreed.

Councilmember Petso referred to a claim regarding safety provided by a trench from oil train shipments and asked whether there was a safety benefit with a trench lowering the trains below grade. Mr. Schaefer answered it would provide containment for an initial spill as long as it occurred within that 7,700 feet.

Council President Buckshnis commented an older study indicated a cut and cover would be a lot less expensive. She asked whether a train trench was the best alternative because it was not covered or were there benefits to a cut and cover. Mr. Schaefer agreed the trench could be decked between Dayton and Main as well as to the north and south which would provide opportunities for redevelopment and broader access to the waterfront. Council President Buckshnis asked whether it would be more expensive. Mr.

Schaefer answered decking on top would make it more expensive; the way the trench was constructed would not be different.

Councilmember Peterson commented in an urban setting the railroad right-of-way is relatively generous. He asked if any condemnation issues were anticipated and how construction would occur in such a tight space. Mr. Schaefer answered it is more than just the two tracks, there is also a maintenance track. He proposed a portion of the through track on the surface remain in place as the maintenance track but not cross Dayton and Main. The area by Harbor Square is a pinch point where additional real estate would be required. It would be a tight working area due to staging and maintaining service; there may be a need for temporary or permanent easements.

Councilmember Peterson asked the project timeframe if everything went relatively well. Mr. Schaefer answered three years. Councilmember Peterson asked how BNSF would keep freight moving during the project. Mr. Schaefer that will be one of BNSF's concerns as well as a provision they will mandate if they have any interest in the project whatsoever. The biggest hurdle is the City does not own any of the right-of-way or the tracks; he anticipated long discussions with BNSF. He recalled negotiations between Sound Transit and BNSF took 10 years.

Councilmember Peterson asked whether sea level rise was taken into account in any of the engineering estimates. Mr. Schaefer answered nothing was included to address sea level rise; that is an issue for the entire rail line not just this section. He recalled after a great deal of discussion regarding sea level rise related to the Seattle seawall, it was recognized that issue affected the entire shoreline not just the one mile seawall.

Councilmember Bloom referred to the staging area for construction near the steep slopes at Pt. Edwards and Sunset Avenue and the maintenance track. Mr. Schaefer advised the track line that would continue in operation would be moved as far toward the water as possible to provide as much clear space on the east side and when the trench was complete, the track would be removed and a spur left for a maintenance track. Councilmember Bloom how much bigger the trench would be than if BNSF built a second rail. Mr. Schaefer answered it was the same size.

Councilmember Bloom asked how the steep slopes would be impacted by the trench. Mr. Schaefer answered the rail bed for double tracking already exists; BNSF only needs to lay the rails. To maintain track on the water side and build a trench inland would require cutting into the slope at Sunset Avenue and the secant piles serving as a retaining wall. Councilmember Bloom observed the secant piles would provide more stability for Sunset Avenue. Mr. Schaefer answered it would provide more stability than cutting into the slope without any retaining wall. As he had not studied the stability of the slope, he could not say it would be more or less stable.

If she found the potential for this project intriguing enough to have an engineering company develop a solution to the Willow Creek bridge issue, Councilmember Petso asked what the next step would be and what the cost would be. Mr. Schaefer answered there were key things to advance that approach including the concept for extending Willow Creek further south with a maintainable entrance, grades to move flows and right-sized channels throughout the year. Another key factor would be obtaining a red, green or yellow signal from the railroad. Councilmember Petso asked if he had a contact at the railroad. Mr. Schaefer answered the City does.

Councilmember Petso asked if there were any engineering solutions to the Willow Creek bridge or did it need to be approached by lengthening the Willow Creek outflow. Mr. Schaefer there are a number of possibilities including a deeper trench with the creek channel on top.

If the City were able to convince BNSF that their best interests could be served via this project and if BNSF were interested in assisting the City, Councilmember Petso asked the cost to obtain a preliminary answer to the Willow Creek bridge question and other questions such as sea level rise. She said citizens have suggested a budget of \$50,000 - \$100,000. Mr. Schaefer agreed answers could be prioritized within that amount.

Council President Buckshnis observed a cut and cover of the trench would be required if Willow Creek went over. Mr. Schaefer agreed, it would be an artificial structure/bridge filled with water.

Councilmember Johnson asked the order of magnitude for an alternatives study to consider all the options to solve the train issue. Mr. Schaefer answered their study did not consider the cost of engineering and evaluating alternatives because creeps into the scope of a full EIS. He was aware there have been discussions about requesting \$1+ million from the State for an EIS, scoping purpose and need, and evaluation of alternatives; that is an appropriate order of magnitude for that type of study.

10. DEPUTY DIRECTOR PARKS JOB DESCRIPTION AND SALARY RANGE APPROVAL

Parks & Recreation Director Carrie Hite recalled last year the Council unanimously approved a decision package for the Recreation Manager to work as an Interim Assistant Director. Ms. McRae has been an invaluable member of the team and has been working in that capacity during the past year. The request tonight is to make that position permanent. The packet includes a job description for a Deputy Director for Parks, a salary survey of four comparable cities with Deputy Director positions, and a recommended salary range for the Deputy Director Position. According to the nonrepresented compensation policy, anyone reclassified into a higher position receives a 5% increase. Because Ms. McRae is currently paid an extra 5% for this interim position, this proposal has no financial impact on the 2015 budget but will impact future budgets as this position moves through steps, etc.

Ms. Hite explained will provide assistance to the Parks & Recreation Department and is part of a succession plan; there are 3 senior managers in the Parks Department, 1 with 40 years of service who likely will retire in the next 1-2 years, Ms. McRae has 26-27 years of service and Ms. Chapin also has a long service with the City. With Ms. McRae working at a Deputy Director level, other staff can be trained into a manager level at some point. Is there are retirements this year, she may ask the Council for funds to reorganize the Parks Department to create efficiencies and fill gaps.

Councilmember Petso recalled a short time ago a decision was made so that the Human Resources Director position could be any of the City's directors. She questioned making the Deputy Director position permanent when Ms. Hite may not be the Human Resources Director in the future. Ms. Hite agreed the Human Resources Reporting Director was at the direction of the Mayor and he could select any director to fulfill those duties. She is currently the Human Resources Reporting Director; the Deputy Director would assist her in the Parks Department. The additional value a Deputy Director adds is the City does not have a park planner. Ms. Hite relayed she does a lot of that work which takes her away from strategic and long term planning. Even if she was the full-time Parks Director, there are still deficits in the Parks Department.

Councilmember Petso said she would support a proposal to reorganize the Parks Department. She understood the reason for the interim Deputy Director and supported it continuing. Ms. Hite pointed out the code only also allows an interim to be extended up to one year and it is reaching the end of a year. Councilmember Petso asked whether Council approval was required after one year. Ms. Hite offered to research that. Mayor Earling advised he foresees keeping the appointment the way it is; the Human Resources Department is running very smoothly and the changes that have instituted over time have been the right move.

Councilmember Johnson pointed out this was revenue neutral for 2015. Councilmember Petso advised her concern was in regard to future years.

Council President Buckshnis expressed her total support for this proposal. Ms. McRae has done a spectacular job, the proposal is revenue neutral and it is time employees who have been with the City a long time are recognized.

Councilmember Peterson asked if establishing this job description would assist with attracting candidates from outside the City in the future. Ms. Hite agreed it was a very strong recruitment tool; it will be easier to recruit for a Deputy Director rather than a Recreation Manager.

Councilmember Bloom observed in the past the job description would have been reviewed by the Public Service/Personnel Committee. She asked what the job description was based on. Ms. Hite explained the job description is consistent with the format of the job descriptions adopted by Council two years ago. The job description was developed by her with the knowledge of what Ms. McRae is doing and using the Deputy Director job descriptions from Issaquah, Sammamish, Lynnwood and Kirkland.

It was the consensus of the Council to schedule this item on next week's Consent Agenda.

Mayor Earling declared a brief recess.

11. DISCUSSION ON THE PROPOSED 2015-2020 CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN/CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

City Engineer Rob English explained the agenda packet includes staff's responses to questions submitted by Councilmembers. In response to a question received from Councilmember Petso late yesterday/early today regarding estimated grant reimbursements in 2015 in the 112 Fund, he distributed a matrix showing the project, the grant source and the amount anticipated to be received in 2015. He noted budgets are developed in late June/early July and numbers change over time. This was the estimate in the July timeframe. For example he anticipated a large amount of the reimbursement for the Five Corners Roundabout would be received in 2014. Reimbursement in 2015 for the 228th corridor project will depend on the contractor's schedule.

Council President Buckshnis referred to options for 9th Avenue that include a roundabout or a light. Public Works Director Phil Williams explained three options were considered for 9th & Main, temporary striping such as was done at Walnut & 9th; the future final project when traffic volumes warrant could be either a roundabout or a light. There has not been enough work done to make a definitive recommendation on either of those options. Council President Buckshnis suggested adding "either or" to the description.

Council President Buckshnis referred to the language for the alternatives study in the CIP, relaying her concern with regionalism and whether the language included emergency access. Mr. Williams responded that project has the longest description of any project in the CIP. The description captures the exact language that was discussed with Council prior to adoption of last year's CIP, language that was offered by former Community Services/Economic Development Director Stephen Clifton. Council President Buckshnis observed the description would include a train trench, cut and cover, etc. Mr. Williams advised it would.

Council President Buckshnis referred to the Sunset Avenue project and the timing of the \$2 million in 2018 and suggested replacing the \$2 million with "unknown." She envisioned Sunset Avenue would be addressed sooner than 2018. Mr. Williams advised funding would be required before any project could be built. The earliest year was 2018 because there is no reasonable expectation of funding before that. The

City already has a grant for design; further spending has been suspended pending feedback on the trial geometry. Council President Buckshnis relayed her understanding that a decision would be made regarding the design by next year. Mr. Williams explained his recommendation has been to have the trial geometry in place for a year to go through all the seasons and then the Council provide some direction regarding on how to evaluate/measure reactions to the trial.

Council President Buckshnis suggested some type of survey will be necessary; she has received both positive and negative input. She felt \$2 million in 2018 was grabbing a number and placing it in a far off date when she anticipated a decision would be made next year. Mr. Williams explained the cost estimate is based on the scope and the project that was identified in the grant applicants submitted to the State. There is no particular reason to change that number absent better information. If the project is changed, certainly the cost estimate can be changed. The intent is to have a number in the CIP to show the City is serious about pursuing a project if it is feasible. The City already received a design grant; leaving a hole in the CIP with regard to construction funding sends an odd signal to future funders of a project. He noted there are a number of projects in the CIP with funding amounts in future years such as the aquatics center.

Council President Buckshnis recommended more money be included in the CFP for traffic calming. She also suggested researching the cost of public restrooms like those provided at the Saturday Market. With regard to traffic calming, Mr. Williams recalled one of the ways to fund the City's agreed-upon local share of the \$320,000 Pine Street crosswalk (\$10,000) was from traffic coalmining. The Council preferred to have that funded from the General Fund which will require a budget amendment to carryover the \$10,000 in traffic calming funds to 2015.

Mayor Earling advised staff has done some exploration regarding public restrooms. Parks & Recreation Director Carrie Hite advised the Economic Development Commission has been working on this issue for some time. The Planning Board recently made a unanimous decision to add public restrooms to the CFP in 2015. The cost to locate porta potties downtown until a more permanent restroom is built is approximately \$12,000 - \$14,000/year. If the Council wanted to pursue that, she recommended it be a General Fund allocation, paid from the Park Maintenance Fund like all other porta potties, rather than the CFP. That way it is an operational expense, not a capital improvement. When a restroom is built, the maintenance would be included in the Park Maintenance budget.

Regarding Sunset Avenue, Councilmember Mesaros relayed his understanding the \$2 million was loose estimate; he asked whether other projects on the CIP also had loose estimates. Mr. Williams explained he has been employed by the City for 4½ years; there were some estimates that he was not certain where they came from originally and they had not changed during that time. Councilmember Mesaros commented his understanding of the CIP was it was an estimate of what may happen, may being the operative word, depending on funding that is identified. Mr. Williams agreed it is related to scope and year of construction; there has not been a consensus on the scope so the number is a placeholder. Councilmember Mesaros summarized that was true for a number of other projects in the CIP. Mr. Williams agreed.

Councilmember Peterson commented the \$2 million for Sunset Avenue is for construction; the reason the funds are included in 2018 is because even if Council decided next year on a scope and plan, it would take time to get it engineered and designed, go through a public process, etc. Best case scenario construction would likely not occur until 2018. Mr. Williams commented the other big variable is the City does not have a funding source and would need to apply for and be successful in obtaining a grant which could take a year or more. Therefore, it does not make sense to have that project any earlier in the CIP than the earliest unconstrained financial year in the CIP.

Councilmember Bloom said she has not had time to submit any questions to staff. She suggested Councilmembers ask questions on the alternatives study and the Sunset Avenue walkway separately from other projects. With regard to the inclusion of bike lanes in a project, she asked whether that was sharrows, physically separated lanes, a grade level change or something else. She learned at a recent transportation workshop that sharrows do not work; there needs to be grade separation or a physical barrier between the bicycle lane, walkway and roadway. Mr. Williams responded a lot of things work; a better bicycle facility can be built if there is enough room and enough money. Bike lanes are dedicated bike lanes, a bicycle facilities may be something different. Mr. English agreed a bike lane is a striped lane on the roadway to delineate the bike lane.

Councilmember Bloom reiterated the transportation workshop she attended stated a striped bike lane is not effective; for the safety, comfort, protection and support of walkers and bikers, there should be some kind of separation either grade or a barrier even if it is as simple as candlesticks between the bike lane and the roadway. She wanted the City to begin thinking in those terms because if the intent was to encourage bicycling, a feeling of comfort or separation needed to be provided.

Councilmember Bloom asked the purpose of \$295,000 allocated in 2015 for the Five Corners intersection improvements. Mr. English explained when estimates were prepared in late June/early July it was anticipated some expenditures might occur in January 2015; a lot of those expenditures will occur in 2014.

Councilmember Bloom referred to the proposal for a signal at the intersection of 196 & 88th. She asked whether the interim plan was a right turn only on the adjoining streets and when that was scheduled to occur. Mr. Williams responded there currently was no plan. A signal has been discussed as a possible solution but there are not sufficient warrants for a signal at that intersection; therefore a signal is not an option. The Council has discussed changing the circulation pattern at the intersection to reduce the potential for certain types of accidents. Limiting through traffic on 88th received a negative reaction and that concept was abandoned.

Councilmember Bloom relayed concerns she has heard related to safety issues at the intersection including the lack of a crosswalk and hazardous left turns. She asked whether a right turn only could be considered. Councilmember Peterson advised that has been discussed in the past but was very controversial. Mr. Williams agreed that would address certain types of accidents but would not address westbound travel on 196th at too high a speed that caused a vehicle to leave the roadway.

Councilmember Bloom referred to the Olympic Avenue from Main Street to Puget Drive Walkway, projected to cost \$1.249 million that she said could easily qualify for a Safe Routes to Schools grant. She has heard many concerns about vehicle speeds and that there is no place to walk. She questioned that being a priority #3 for long walkways, yet was not scheduled for study until 2021 – 2026. She compared that walkway to the Sunset Avenue Walkway, noting there are not the same safety issues on Sunset. Sunset is a feel good project; the Olympic Avenue Walkway is about safety for school children. She asked why it was scheduled so far out in the future and why it did not have a higher priority. Mr. Williams answered the only real source of funds is Safe Routes to Schools; staff tries to identify projects on the CIP that will score well in the competition for funds. Mr. English explained when the 2009 Transportation Plan was developed, that walkway was ranked third; one of the recommendations was to change the classification of Olympic Avenue from a local to a collector street as traffic volumes are more similar to a collector and the opportunity to obtain funding would improve if the designation was changed. There was resistance from citizens on Olympic Avenue to changing it from a local to a collector. There is an existing asphalt walkway on the east side of the road. The Council did not approve the designation change and the project was moved into the out years. Councilmember Bloom suggested that be brought to the attention of the Transportation Committee.

Councilmember Bloom asked whether a description regarding how to apply for traffic calming funds was posted to the City's website. Mr. Williams answered he will check to see whether that has been accomplished yet.

Councilmember Bloom observed the Stormwater CFP is fairly short. She asked whether any other locations were identified as high flood risks after the August 29, 2013 flood that resulted in several claims filed against City due to flooding. Mr. Williams responded that storm was a good reminder of where a lot of flooding exposure exists in the system such as the Dayton/Walnut system. Mr. English added 4th Avenue was another area that experienced flooding; a project was completed in September/October 2014 to address the problem.

Councilmember Petso observed there are a number of projects with a bike lane component. She recalled a concern she expressed earlier that the Bike Plan in the Transportation Plan does not identify the same locations for bike lanes. For example the Bike Plan has bike lanes on 84th and not on 76th. Mr. Williams answered that was the 2009 Transportation Plan; the update to that plan is being prepared and likely will be adopted in June 2015. Many things have changed since the 2009 Transportation Plan was adopted and there are likely a number of things that are not consistent with 2009 Transportation Plan. Mr. English pointed out the 2009 Transportation Plan identified bike lanes on 76th Avenue. Mr. Williams noted the City also has a grant for that project.

Councilmember Petso asked whether it was Mr. Williams' opinion that removing multiuse path from the Sunset Avenue Walkway description would cause the granting agency concern. Mr. Williams answered that was still his opinion; he did not know the answer but did not want take that risk. He anticipated a much better chance of a positive result in discussions with the granting agency if the City collected information and conducted a disciplined process to evaluate the trial design. Councilmember Petso recalled a comment during audience comment regarding what information the City was planning to collect. Mr. Williams advised the City is collecting speed information via speed tubes in two locations on Sunset Avenue, accident information, etc. There are no formal plans for other information gathering; the Council could decide whether to conduct a statistically valid survey or a format for people to provide input. He suggested it would be helpful to have guidance from the Council regarding the evaluation.

Councilmember Petso referred to the CFP page for the Sunset Walkway that shows a walkway from Main to Caspers, the text states Bell to Caspers and some of the project variations have included Caspers Street. She asked what project was being considered, whether it was as outlined in the temporary markings. Mr. Williams answered the Council could do anything they wanted within reason on Caspers; there is plenty of right-of-way to design the elements on Caspers, there is no obvious limitation or fatal flaw. The same is true on the south end of the project where the Sunset Avenue Overlook was envisioned; none of that would be impacted by the railroad. The area where the most interest/concern was expressed was the narrowest section of the project in the middle whether the trial project is intended to gather information. Councilmember Petso asked whether the CFP should be revised if the intent was to do something on Caspers. Mr. Williams answered it was not necessary in the 2015 CFP, it could be done in the 2016 CFP if further details regarding the Caspers project was available.

Councilmember Petso referred to the addition of a project at 216th & Highway 99, asking the rationale for adding that project when Highway 99 & 205th, which was a far bigger problem, was not added. Mr. Williams explained after discussions with Carl Zapora, Verdant, who owns the property; Jim Underhill, a resident in the area; and representatives of Value Village, the building tenant, interim improvements were identified that were basically paint. This included marking a crosswalk on the west side of 72nd crossing 216th, removing 3 of the 6 angle parking spaces on the south side of the building that created conflicts with traffic turning off Highway 99 traffic and backing movements and converting the remaining 3 to

employee parking. Long term that corner may be repurposed by the property owner which would be the right time to require frontage improvements that tie pedestrians on the north side of Highway 99 with 76th Avenue.

Councilmember Petso clarified her inquiry was the intersection improvement at Highway 99 & 216th related to protective/permissive left hand turns. Mr. English explained that project adds a dedicated left turn lane for eastbound and westbound lanes. Councilmember Petso asked whether the rationale for that improvement was traffic volume or a failed intersection. She relayed the intersection at Highway 99 & 205th is failed but nothing is done. Mr. English did not recall there was a LOS F at that intersection.

Assuming she wanted improvements made at other intersection such as 205th & Highway 99 and 76th & SR 104, Councilmember Petso asked how those could be included in the plan. Mr. English recommended having a project vetted through the process of updating the 2015 Transportation Plan. Councilmember Petso asked whether the another approach would be to draft a project sheet and vote it into the plan. Mr. Williams responded that was technically doable but he questioned whether it was the right way to do traffic engineering. The Council awarded a contract to a very competent traffic engineer who will evaluate the City's intersections, update traffic counts, calculate levels of service, identify intersection movements that have failed or will fail during the planning phase and identify possible projects to include in the plan. Councilmember Petso asked why 216th & Highway 99 was being added in advance of the evaluation but not the other two. Mr. Williams advised 216th & Highway 99 was identified in the 2009 plan; the project related to Value Village was an addition. Councilmember Petso offered to follow up with staff during the next week.

Councilmember Johnson commented the 2009 Transportation Plan identified some good projects that included the long walkway at Olympic View Drive. She recalled conversations about 196th & 88th, noting although it may be controversial, it warrants additional discussion either this year or next year. She concurred with Councilmember Bloom's comments regarding that intersection.

Councilmember Johnson expressed concern with inconsistencies between project descriptions and/or amounts: She asked staff to research the following examples:

1. Sunset Avenue
 - o Page 40 CFP: Project description is a multiuse pathway and \$2,350,000 project cost
 - o Page 31 CIP: project description is a sidewalk on the west side and \$1,876,000 project cost
2. Civic Center Complex Improvements
 - o Project costs of \$6.1 million and \$6.3 million
3. City Park Revitalization
 - o Different project amounts on page 29 and page 62

Councilmember Johnson expressed concern with the sequence of events related to Marina Beach. Page 35 of the CIP includes a \$130,000 project for improvements including expanding the parking area, replacing play structures, etc. Page 66 includes language regarding Edmonds Marsh Willow Creek Daylighting with a 50/50 split between Parks and Stormwater with a total cost of \$200,000. She was concerned doing the improvements prior to the Master Plan would be out of sequence. Ms. Hite assured the improvements would not be done prior to the Master Plan. The City executed a contract with a consultant to assist with the master planning process and she anticipated presenting a concept to Council by mid-2015. The replacement of the Marina Beach playground equipment is on the CIP for 2015. If the Master Plan identifies the location, it will be replaced in 2015; if a complete redo of the park is recommended that can be accomplished in the next 2-3 years, the playground equipment will not be replaced. If a complete redo of the park is recommended and cannot be completed within 10 years, the playground equipment likely will be replaced. The \$200,000 for the Edmonds Marsh Willow Creek Daylighting is for 60% design on the actual daylighting of Willow Creek.

Councilmember Johnson referred to miscellaneous open space at \$200,000, recommending that amount be increased even if it meant not replacing the play equipment at Marina Beach; that was a tradeoff she was willing to consider.

Councilmember Bloom referred to the PSRC's TAP cost estimate for the Sunset Avenue Walkway. She relayed her understanding the trial walkway was east of the original walkway and mostly off BNSF property. Mr. Williams explained City's street already occupies as much as 14-feet of BNSF property and BNSF does not seem to have an issue with that. The intent was to establish a walkway that did not extend past the existing curb. Councilmember Bloom asked about the trial striping that jogs to the west. Mr. Williams advised where the ownership changes, the trial project jogs the walkway west of the curb and paves that short section of walkway. In the area where BNSF owns a portion of the right-of-way, that dictated the geometry. There have been suggestions to remove the planter strip and sidewalk on the east and have the walkway on the west side serve as the pedestrian facility.

Councilmember Bloom asked whether the estimate includes potential shoring of the hillside for a walkway. Mr. Williams answered there was thought about talking with BNSF about whether they saw value in a partnership to shore 1-2 areas. That is not included in the estimate. If that was done, it would be in addition to the current cost estimate.

Councilmember Bloom asked whether stormwater and sewer improvements were included in the cost estimate. Mr. Williams answered no, explaining those assets needed attention anyway. Better stormwater drainage was needed on Sunset Avenue regardless of the walkway, the water line is old and needs to be replaced and it would be a good idea to replace the existing sewer line that runs through backyards at the north end of the street with a gravity sewer line. Councilmember Bloom asked whether those improvements were on any project list if the Sunset Avenue walkway was not pursued. Mr. Williams answered by themselves those utility projects are not top priorities; they would be done as part of the transportation project.

Councilmember Bloom asked what the three estimates include and whether any of them include stormwater improvements and shoring of the hillside. Mr. English advised Council President Buckshnis asked a similar question and staff referenced the TAP estimate, \$1,876,354. Because the project was placed in the out years, inflation was added to that amount, for a cost estimate of \$2,099,000. The estimates for water and sewer are not included but stormwater improvements are included. He clarified there is only one estimate, \$1,876,354, which was prepared when the City applied for the TAP funds. The \$2,099,000 is simply the \$1,876,354 inflated for the out years. Councilmember Johnson referred to a \$2,350,000 estimated project cost on page 47 of the CFP.

Councilmember Peterson suggested placeholder was a better word than estimate. The extent of the project is unknown so it cannot be estimated. Mr. Williams suggested the scope was needed to turn a guess into an estimate; for the Sunset Avenue project, there is not an accurate enough description to price it out. An assumed scope was used to prepare the TAP application; a detailed cost estimate cannot be prepared because so little design has been done.

Councilmember Mesaros suggested the right term may be ballpark instead of estimate. Mr. Williams said ranges could be provided for projects for which little design has been done such as Tetra Tech provided for the train trench. He commented the precision of the estimate is where issues often arise. Council President Buckshnis preferred the term placeholder.

Mr. English said the \$2,350,000 in the CFP is the estimated total project cost and includes \$2,099,000 plus \$10,000 in 2015 plus costs expended to date.

Councilmember Bloom said she did not understand what would be studied in the alternatives study scheduled in 2018. There is a lot of support for a trench; 148 people at least have sent emails. Edmonds Crossing is in the CIP, yet there is no plan for emergency vehicle access in the Comprehensive Plan, CIP or CFP. She has not heard any citizen support for a tunnel or overpass. She preferred to focus on the train trench, leave Edmonds Crossing in the CIP and plan for emergency vehicle access. She asked why consideration was being given to studying a tunnel or overpass when a tunnel would require two lanes of traffic each way to/from the ferry, one dedicated lane for emergency vehicle access, restrooms and the Reid Middleton study says an enclosed tunnel would be an extremely expensive solution and provide a terrible environment for ferry users waiting to load.

Mr. Williams responded whatever project the City decides to pursue to achieve a grade separation at Main will need partners; the obvious partner is WSDOT Ferries Division due to their interest in alleviating trains blocking ferry loading/unloading. Before any project can proceed alternatives must be considered. He recalled the Council's concern years ago that staff presumed a solution; the intent at that time was to name a project and then analyze alternatives. He stressed the importance of considering the pros and cons of available alternatives so that a matrix can be prepared to compare cost, efficacy, acceptability, environmental compliance, etc. It was unlikely a funding source would provide funds without an alternatives analysis.

Councilmember Bloom suggested starting with the Reid Middleton study that evaluated 10 alternatives, rather than seeking funds to study a 5-lane tunnel that would be an unpleasant experience. She felt there was enough information to eliminate that option. Mr. Williams disagreed, explaining staff began with the Reid Middleton study which selected Edmonds Crossing; although a tremendous project, the project costs were too high. Another alternative was then selected and a study proposed to review that as well as other alternatives. Councilmember Bloom pointed out although the Reid Middleton study was conducted in 1990, the issues have not changed; only the costs would be much higher. She noted the Reid Middleton study stated the engineering challenges of a tunnel would exceed the cost of Edmonds Crossing. She preferred to start with the Reid Middleton study and what the community is saying rather than seeking funding for something that is not supported by the community.

Councilmember Peterson pointed out technology has changed drastically since the Reid Middleton study was done in 1990. If the engineering technology exists to do a train trench, the same technology could be used for a tunnel. The most immediate question is emergency access; the only way to provide emergency access is under or over the at-grade conflict. Councilmember Bloom pointed out there is discussion about emergency access at Bell Street. Councilmember Peterson agreed there that is an alternative that needs to be studied. He disagreed there was no support in the community for a tunnel, he and other supported a tunnel but at this time the design was unknown. To be fiducially responsible to the citizens, the Council has to consider all the all alternatives. The alternatives need to be considered in light of new technology, new ideas and new thinking. He recalled the concern 1-2 years ago was that the City's administration had selected a solution and were not looking at anything else. Now Councilmember Bloom was saying the train trench should be selected because 148 people have written emails.

Councilmember Bloom clarified the Council needed to consider what the public was saying as well as the information in the Reid Middleton study and address emergency vehicle access separately so that it could be accomplished sooner. Councilmember Peterson pointed out one of the reasons for not separating out emergency vehicle access was there likely would be no funding from another source for that project and the City would be required to fund it in its entirety.

Councilmember Petso was pleased this conversation was occurring in public. She agreed there needed to be resources for an emergency access; she anticipated mitigation money from the oil train people or an

RCO grant by claiming it is recreation access to the waterfront particularly if it occurred at Pt. Edwards. The problem of train issues facing Edmonds results in one matrix; ferry issues that impact the City may result in a different matrix. Her job as a Councilmember is to address train issues that lend support to moving ahead with an emergency access or at least spending money to determine which of the alternatives might work. She agreed if something was not done to comprehensively solve all the problems, the result would be one at a time solutions. She suggested pursuing the three projects that solve all the problems to a level of understanding whether they will work and select one. Another approach is to abandon all those solutions and focus on building an emergency access and start searching for funding partners.

Councilmember Mesaros commented an alternatives study would be required to achieve what Councilmember Petso suggests; any partner will want to know what alternatives have been considered and why the selected solution was determined to be the best. He has a favorite project and was hopeful the alternatives study would support that project. Information from an alternatives study will allow the Council to make a good decision; without that information the right solution may be eliminated for the wrong reason.

To Councilmember Bloom's question regarding why alternatives needed to be studied, Councilmember Johnson explained both the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) require looking at alternatives.

Mayor Earling agreed with Councilmember Johnson, an EIS process would ultimately be required. An alternative analysis is necessary for the Council to reach the right answer; whatever project is selected will require funding partners. The State is a logical funding partner and if the cost is high enough, federal funds will be necessary. His idea was never a tunnel; it was a cut and cover. The process starts with studying and selecting alternatives to enter the environmental study stage before approaching the state or federal for funding.

COUNCILMEMBER MESAROS MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER PETSO, TO EXTEND THE MEETING UNTIL 10:20 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

12. PUBLIC COMMENT AND CONTINUED DISCUSSION REGARDING THE 2015 PROPOSED CITY BUDGET

Finance Director Scott James displayed the list of Preliminary Budget Book Changes. He invited Council questions and amendments to the budget.

Mayor Earling opened the opportunity for public comment; there were no members of the public present.

If sufficient funding could be identified to restore a Crime Prevention Officer that could be sustained for a few years, Councilmember Petso asked whether sufficient equipment and staff support could be cobbled together to allow that person to function or would an additional allocation be required. Police Chief Al Compaan anticipated the amount in the draft decision package may not be adequate to support that position and fill that position in today's very competitive market. Most of the additional cost would be salary and benefits. If the position is filled, he emphasized the importance of a sustainable funding source because it was not fair to the person hired and it also creates operational issues when a person is hired and then laid off.

Councilmember Petso asked whether any other cities Edmonds' size did not have a Crime Prevention Officer. Chief Compaan could not think of a city Edmonds' size in the Puget Sound area that did not have a crime prevention officer. He noted that position may have a different title in other police departments; Edmonds has not had that function in its Police Department since 2009.

Councilmember Petso inquired about the beginning balance of the 125 Fund. Mr. James advised an error was made in developing the budget that originated with a transfer in 2013. Half the transfer was captured in Fund 132; Fund 125 is short \$100,000. In discussions with Mr. Williams and Ms. Hite, a solution was developed but that has not been reviewed with the Mayor. Councilmember Petso relayed her understanding the Council will be informed once the solution has been reviewed with the Mayor.

Council President Buckshnis referred to audience comments about Fire District 1 and asked for an update. Mayor Earling advised there has been a follow-up meeting with Fire District 1 and another meeting is scheduled in mid-December. Some progress has been made on identifying more consistent numbers. There are still a couple major issues related to Edmonds and he was hopeful those could be discussed at the next meeting. In response to questions why this has not occurred in the public, he explained these are sensitive discussions that Fire District 1 would prefer occur between staff and Commissioners. He was hopefully a final report could be provided following the meeting in December.

Council President Buckshnis asked why payment for retroactivity was proposed to be paid from the Contingency Reserve Fund. Mr. James relayed Fire District 1 has offered to split the amount into eight quarterly payments. The 2015 budget proposed funding it from the Contingency Reserve once this year and once next year. Once there is final approval on the eight quarterly payments, the transfers will be adjusted back to the General Fund.

Council President Buckshnis urged Councilmembers to submit questions to Mr. James. The budget was originally scheduled for action on next week's agenda but she preferred to delay action a week due to Mayor Earling's absence next week.

Councilmember Petso observed the budget includes money in the Utility Fund for overlay work; she assumed that was overlay as part of a watermain replacement. She asked about additional amounts in the budget that are direct transfers from the Utility Funds to the Street Construction Fund. Mr. Williams answered they were for same purpose; a transportation project that includes replacing utilities. The utility contributes what they would have paid to fix the pavement to the transportation project and the transportation project paves the entire segment.

Councilmember Johnson alerted the Council to her suggestion that \$5,000/year be budgeted for the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) calendar. Mr. James advised that is included in the list of Preliminary Budget Book Changes. He highlighted recent changes to the budget:

- HPC Calendar –ongoing (\$5,000)
- Council meeting videotaping (\$6,500)
- Tree Board Minute Taking (\$1,400)

Councilmember Johnson suggested adding \$2,000 to videotape Planning Board meetings, advising Planning Board Members were supportive of that idea. Mr. James agreed to add that to the list of proposed changes.

13. COUNCIL EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT AND LEGISLATIVE ASSISTANT

This item was rescheduled to the December 2 meeting.

14. REPORT ON OUTSIDE BOARD AND COMMITTEE MEETINGS

This item was postponed to a future meeting.

15. MAYOR'S COMMENTS

Mayor Earling reminded of the Christmas tree lighting ceremony on Saturday at 5:15 p.m.

Mayor Earling relayed Puget Sound Regional Council informed the of a \$780,000 grant for the 220th Street overlay and a \$3,020,000 grant for 76th & 212th intersection improvements. He thanked staff for their efforts.

Mayor Earling advised five candidates for the Municipal Judge position were interviewed today. The number of candidates will be narrowed and additional interviews will be held. He intends to present a recommended candidate to the Council at the December 16 meeting. He wished everyone a Happy Thanksgiving.

16. COUNCIL COMMENTS

Council President Buckshnis wished everyone a Happy Thanksgiving.

Councilmember Bloom announced the Port of Edmonds' Holiday on the Docks beginning at noon on Sunday and Christmas Ships arrive on December 9 and leave the dock at 7:00 p.m.

Councilmember Peterson wished everyone a Happy Thanksgiving and said Go Hawks.

Councilmember Petso commented discussion regarding the study session has be delayed. She suggested only those people who voted in favor of the study session should be required to sit with their backs to screen which would exempt her.

Student Representative Eslami recognized the Edmonds-Woodway High School girls' soccer team for winning State. He also wished everyone a Happy Thanksgiving

With regard to the tree lighting ceremony, Councilmember Johnson relayed there will be refreshment at Centennial Plaza beginning at 3:30 p.m. and the program begins at 4:30 p.m.

17. CONVENE IN EXECUTIVE SESSION REGARDING PENDING OR POTENTIAL LITIGATION PER RCW 42.30.110(1)(i)

This item was not needed.

18. RECONVENE IN OPEN SESSION. POTENTIAL ACTION AS A RESULT OF MEETING IN EXECUTIVE SESSION

This item was not needed.

19. ADJOURN

With no further business, the Council meeting was adjourned at 10:25 p.m.