

APPROVED JUNE 24TH

**CITY OF EDMONDS
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

June 10, 2009

Vice Chair Lovell called the meeting of the Edmonds Planning Board to order at 7:04 p.m. in the Council Chambers, Public Safety Complex, 250 – 5th Avenue North.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Philip Lovell, Vice Chair
John Reed
Jim Young
Kevin Clarke
Valerie Stewart

STAFF PRESENT

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager
Robert English, City Engineer
Bertrand Hauss, Transportation Engineer
Karin Noyes, Recorder

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT

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

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER REED MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF MAY 27, 2009 BE APPROVED AS PRESENTED. BOARD MEMBER YOUNG SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS

Jim Hunger, Edmonds, said his 10-year-old son recently visited his aunt in California, and she kept chickens. When he returned he asked if he could have chickens, but the City does not currently allow this use in single-family zones. He urged the Board to recommend approval of an ordinance that would allow hens (not roosters) to be kept in single-family zones in the City. He pointed out that keeping chickens is a great way to show his son ways of sustainability. They consider themselves urban farmers, and they raise many of their own vegetables. They would love to have chickens and enjoy their eggs. Passing the ordinance would also demonstrate to his son that the government is for and by the people.

Barbara Tipton, Edmonds, agreed with Mr. Hunger's comments. She said she is a member of Sustainable Edmonds, which a 4013C organization that operates within the boundaries of the City. They are in the process of identifying goals and policies for the sustainability element of the Edmonds Comprehensive Plan. The group recommends that hens be allowed in single-family zones. She noted that several of Sustainable Edmond's interests overlap with the proposed ordinance that would allow the keeping of hens in single-family zones. The organization advocates a locally-based and safe food supply, as well as organic new production. She pointed out that chickens provide a source for fresh eggs. During a hen's first year of life, it will yield anywhere between 180 and 320 eggs, and then production tapers off. Caring for hens would be a wonderful education experience for children, teaching them responsibility and their connection to the food sources. In addition, they

will have fun gathering the eggs. She noted that chickens are a good source for eating vegetable scraps, and they in turn produce nitrogen. When the nitrogen is combined with a carbon source such as straw, etc, manure is made, essentially closing the loop.

Ms. Tipton said that while she supports the City allowing hens in single-family zones, the ordinance must clearly address certain issues such as no roosters, limiting the number of chickens to more than one but fewer than four, requiring a minimum coop size of 30 square feet, and prohibiting the use to occur in the setback areas. She noted that chickens are social animals and they need other chickens around them. They also need space. The ordinance could also require that the hens be securely closed in at night and that the odor from the coops be managed. She suggested there may be some economic development value to the proposal, as well, since some businesses may want to sell coops to City residents, and this would bring in additional tax dollars. In addition, an expert may want to offer classes at the Francis Anderson Center to provide more information about raising hens. She invited the Board to attend the Seattle Tilth Event on July 11th from 2:00 to 4:00 p.m., where they will provide tours to view backyard coops. She agreed to send the Board a link to their website.

Rick Doughty, Edmonds, said his family has talked about getting chickens for two years and only learned at the last minute there was an ordinance that prohibited fowl in Edmonds. He said he has talked to various animal control experts from areas that allow chickens, including the City of Seattle, and received good input. He also contacted Seattle Tilth, who provides urban chicken classes, and they indicated their classes have skyrocketed into a whole program about chickens. He read a letter into the record from Angelina Shell, Coordinator for Seattle Tilth, which voiced support for the proposed amendment.

Mr. Doughty said he also spoke with Officer Gorman, Lynnwood's Animal Control Officer, who expressed that he receives very few complaints about chickens. He felt that Lynnwood's nuisance ordinance was effective in handling the calls he does receive. He noted that less than 5% of the calls need correction beyond the initial visit, and he strongly encouraged him to pursue the possibility of lifting the ban on chickens in Edmonds. He said he also spoke with a Seattle Animal Control Officer who indicated he was neither in favor nor against the keeping of chickens in single-family zones. However, he indicated that complaints about dogs and cats far outweigh those associated with chickens. He indicated that Seattle's nuisance code allows good enforcement. He noted that major cities such as Seattle, New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, Denver, San Francisco, Portland, Atlanta and Vancouver, B.C. allow chickens in their single-family zones. Everett, Tacoma, Bellevue, Olympia, Spokane, Woodinville, Mill Creek, Mountlake Terrace, Shoreline and Lynnwood allow them, as well, based on varying laws and ordinances.

Mr. Doughty summarized that for his family, keeping chickens would mean fresh eggs and taking three hens from industrialized farming to give them the joy of living in his backyard.

PUBLIC HEARING ON DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Mr. Hauss introduced Jennifer Barnes, ICF Jones and Stokes, who would help him present the draft Comprehensive Transportation Plan to the Board and public. He reminded the Board of the presentation they provided to the Board on May 27th. He announced that since that time, the following changes have been made to the draft document:

- Five sidewalk projects were added based on input from the Transportation Committee.
- The total cost of the plan was revised to reflect the additional sidewalk projects.
- The 4th Avenue Enhancement Project was raised in priority for the purpose of providing example funding scenarios.
- Projected revenue from the Parks Department was added for the Interurban Trail and 4th Avenue Enhancement Projects.
- Example funding scenarios were refined to reflect adjustments to project priorities, costs, and revenue projections.
- An assessment of existing citywide pavement conditions was added.

Mr. Hauss reviewed that the purpose of the Transportation Plan is to guide the development of multi-modal transportation, support the City's transportation goals and policies, and support projected land use through 2025. He specifically reviewed elements of the draft plan as follows:

APPROVED

- **Street System Improvements:** He said there are three different types of roadway projects: concurrency projects, safety projects and highways of statewide significance projects. He explained that concurrency projects are identified based on the City's adopted Level of Service (LOS) standard and current land use plan. Using this process, they identified four existing locations where the City's LOS standard is already exceeded. They identified four additional locations that would exceed the City's standard by 2015, and three additional locations by 2025.
- **Non-Motorized System:** He explained that the non-motorized element includes both the Walkway Plan and the Bikeway Plan. The Walkway Plan proposes additional walkways (10 short, 24 long, and the 4th Avenue Enhancement Project). In addition, it includes the ADA Transition Plan, which identifies the necessary curb ramp retrofits that must be accomplished to make all of the sidewalks at intersections in Edmonds ADA compliant. The Bikeway Plan recommends locations for additional bike parking and signing of three bike loops. In addition, it recommends that bike lanes be provided where feasible on future roadway projects. If a bike lane is not possible, sharrow pavement markings should be provided to indicate the shared use of the road by vehicles and bicyclists.
- **Transit Improvements.** He noted that City policies support additional improved bus shelters, additional transit service, and transportation demand management. However, it is important to note there is no direct transit investments by the City included in the plan.

Ms. Barnes reviewed the pie charts that were prepared to illustrate the estimated costs of the draft plan, as well as the projected revenue. She noted that the cost pie chart was slightly different than the one provided at the May 27th meeting to account for the additional walkway projects that were added upon the recommendation of the Transportation Committee. She announced that the total cost for implementation of the plan would be approximately \$105 million through 2025.

Ms. Barnes advised that the cost versus revenue pie chart was also slightly different. Upon the request of the Board, the consultant and staff coordinated with the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services staff regarding the Interurban Trail and 4th Avenue Enhancement Projects. At their last presentation, this funding was accounted for separately. About \$3 million has now been added to the total revenue projection. The sources for the various funding have been listed in the plan and identify parks funding for these two projects as a special source. She noted that the projections were based on an updated impact fee of \$1,071 per trip. The total from identified sources is estimated to be about \$41 million by 2025, which would result in a funding shortfall of about \$64 million.

Ms. Barnes summarized that although the revenue and cost numbers have changed slightly, the outlook is still basically the same. Based on the current funding scenario, projected revenue would fund about 23% of the draft plan. Road projects would be 22% funded, which would address the existing concurrency problems that have been identified in the plan. However, it would not provide sufficient funding to address the concurrency problems that are projected by the years 2015 and 2025. Pedestrian and bicycle projects would be 21% funded, and the street overlay program would be on an 80-year rather than 20-year cycle. It would take 75 years to complete all of the identified ADA curb ramp retrofits, and the traffic calming program would remain unfunded.

Ms. Barnes recalled a discussion from the May 27th meeting that there is a certain amount of projected revenue that would not be available based on the continuation of past trends because three of the funding sources (grants, impact fees, and joint agencies) require the City to provide some level of matching funds. The City may not be able to apply for certain types of grants if their "other" funding is insufficient to meet City share. She noted that of the \$40 million revenue projected under the current funding scenario, it is estimated that \$16 million would be left on the table because the City would be unable to meet the matching requirement.

Mr. Barnes reported that additional funding sources were explored for the funding scenarios. She reviewed each of the options as follows:

- **Transportation Benefit District (TBD)** – She explained that while the City has already approved a \$20 vehicle licensing fee, the law allows the City to assess an additional fee of up to \$80 with voter approval. She explained that the funding scenarios were provided for the purpose of putting costs and revenues into context. However, she emphasized that appropriate funding levels and specific projects to be funded would be identified as part of a total funding package

prior to putting the concept out to vote. She advised that the projected TBD revenue was based upon the assumption of 36,400 licensed vehicles in the City multiplied by \$80 per year per vehicle for 16 years. The total estimated revenue generated by the TBD would be about \$4.6 million through 2025.

- **Business License Fee for Transportation** – She advised that this fee would typically be used to fund improvements that are most beneficial to businesses. She emphasized that the appropriate level of funding and specific projects to be funded would typically be developed as part of a total funding package, in collaboration with local business owners. The projected license fee revenue is based upon the assumption of 12,000 employees multiplied by \$92.27 per year per employee for 16 years. This would generate about \$18 million per year, which would close the funding gap through 2025.

Ms. Barnes referred to a chart that was prepared to illustrate the results of example funding scenarios and what the City could get based on different levels of funding. However, she cautioned that the scenarios are not set in stone since the actual funding levels and projects to be funded would be determined at a later date. As requested by the Board, a line was added to identify the average yearly revenue. A line was also added to identify the projected revenue that would be “left on the table” because the City did not have sufficient funds to match grant, joint agency and impact fee projects. She pointed out that roadway projects would only be 22% funded based on the current funding scenario, which means that rather than a 20-year overlay cycle, the City’s cycle would be increased to 80 years. The ADA transition would take up to 75 years to complete, and only a quarter of the bicycle and walkway projects would be funded.

Ms. Barnes pointed out that based on the current funding scenario, \$16.6 million would be left on the table because the City would not have the ability to provide matching funds for grant, impact fee and joint agency projects. An additional \$80 TBD is projected to generate up to \$45 million over 16 years, which would enable the City to accomplish approximately \$60 million additional transportation investments over current funding or \$1.30 in additional transportation investment for every \$1 spent. An \$80 TBD plus a business license fee would allow the City to generate up to \$64 million over 16 years, resulting in approximately \$80 million additional transportation investments over current funding or \$1.25 in additional transportation investment for every \$1 spent. She cautioned that these examples represent the order of magnitude based upon example funding scenarios. Actual leverage would depend on the mix of projects and availability of grants and other external sources.

Ms. Barnes explained that there are great advantages to having a Comprehensive Transportation Plan in place even though a lot of the projects would be identified as unfunded. The plan lays out the City’s priorities for concurrency, safety, walkways, bicycle paths, and transit services. Regardless of how the City chooses to move forward, the plan provides a good start to pursuing the additional sources of funding. While funding recommendations would not be adopted as part of the plan, staff is recommending the City move forward with pursuing additional revenue sources as part of the City Council’s adoption of the plan.

She explained that the Board has the option of recommending approval of the plan and forwarding it to the City Council with a recommendation to pursue additional funding in the future or recommend approval of the plan with a recommendation for no additional funding. If they recommend no additional funding, then one or more of the following actions would be required in the future:

- Lower the City’s concurrency standards.
- Revise City policies to support a lower level of non-motorized infrastructure.
- Lower City’s level of commitment to maintenance and preservation.
- Revise future land use plan to reflect lower level of future development and/or shifts in land use densities.

Ms. Barnes reviewed that once the Board has forwarded their recommendation to the City Council, the staff and consultant would provide a briefing to the City Council in preparation for another formal public hearing. An additional public open house would be held in late June (tentatively scheduled for June 30th). The draft document has also been forwarded to the Washington State Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development (CTED), Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC), Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) and Snohomish County and adjacent cities for their

review and comment. Staff anticipates the City Council would take final action in July and the final document would be adopted as part of the annual Comprehensive Plan update later in the fall.

Board Member Young inquired regarding the status of the City's new Transportation Benefit District. Mr. Chave said the District is currently in the implementation stage, working out agreements with the State Department of Licensing, etc. He explained that the City Council has formally established the program, and they have met at least twice as the Transportation Benefit District Board. He said he is not sure about the exact date the City would start collecting the \$20 vehicle license fee. Board Member Young summarized that the Transportation Benefit District has the authority to impose a \$20 vehicle license fee based on an administrative decision of the City Council. However, a vote would be required in order to impose a greater fee (up to \$100).

Board Member Young inquired about the legal significance with CTED if the City does not engage in all of their identified concurrency projects within the next two to five years. Ms. Barnes explained that the plan identifies three levels of concurrency projects: those that currently exist, those that are projected by 2015 and those that are projected by 2025. The City is required by law to identify funding for concurrency projects within a six-year time period from the time the need was identified. The current revenue projection would provide sufficient funding for the City to resolve the existing concurrency situations. However, there would be insufficient funding to address those that are anticipated by 2015 and 2025. She summarized that the City would have some time to figure out funding sources to address the future problems, but decisions would have to be made in the next 5 or 6 years.

Board Member Reed asked how safety projects are prioritized. Ms. Barnes said there is no State law that requires the City to accomplish safety improvements. However, because safety has been identified as a high priority by the citizens and the Transportation Committee, safety projects are a policy priority in the plan. She noted that non-motorized projects were also identified as a high priority by the citizens. Therefore, there is policy in the plan for having a strong non-motorized element. However, she noted that the City is not required to fund these projects, either.

Vice Chair Lovell asked if it would be legal for the City to lower their LOS standard. Ms. Barnes explained that while State law requires local governments to have concurrency standards in place, it does not dictate what LOS standard would be acceptable. The law merely requires that cities define thresholds for LOS, and cities have the ability to change their standards at any time. If there is insufficient funding to pay for concurrency, one alternative would be to revisit and perhaps lower the standard. However, she reminded the Board that impact fees are based on concurrency and can fund up to 40% of concurrency projects. If the City chooses to change their concurrency standards, the impact fees would have to be revisited, as well.

Vice Chair Lovell recalled that at their last meeting, the Board suggested the consultant and staff meet with the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services staff to discuss funding for the 4th Avenue Enhancement Project. He further recalled that when the 4th Avenue Enhancement Project was presented to the Board, staff indicated that some grant funding had already been identified and that other grant applications had been submitted. However, the draft plan does not identify sufficient funding for the project unless the voters approve at least an additional TBD of \$30. Ms. Barnes replied that the total cost of the 4th Avenue Enhancement and Interurban Trail Projects is \$5.5 million, and they have coordinated with the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services staff to identify the current available sources of funding. As a result of this effort, \$2 million was added to the revenue projections. That left them with \$3 million to account for in the funding scenarios. The cost projections did not change, but the revenue projections did. Even though the two projects were raised in priority, the \$3 million needed to pay for the rest of the projects would not be available based on the current funding scenario. Once again, she emphasized that the funding scenarios were prepared for illustrative purposes to show the magnitude of what the City could fund under the different scenarios. It would be up to the City Council to make a decision to put more money in the 4th Avenue Enhancement Project and reduce funding in other areas.

George Murray, Edmonds, said he appreciated the materials provided by the consultant and staff. However, if he were on the City Council, he would like to know what is different about the new draft plan versus the existing plan. Secondly, from the numbers in the plan it appears that Edmonds would not grow a significant amount, so he questioned the proposed plan implementation cost of over \$100 million. Also, he said he would like to see a timeline showing revenues and costs from year to year for projects, including maintenance. The plan could identify those projects that must be done, those the City

would like to accomplish, and those they would dream of doing if funding were available. Again, he said it would be helpful if the expenses were laid out over time. As more revenue is added, projects that are not necessarily required could be added to the list.

Neal Tibbit, Edmonds, said he served on the task force that produced the City's last Comprehensive Plan, and he is currently serving on the Citizens Advisory Transportation Committee. He said he has four children who live in Edmonds, and they use the sidewalks and streets for bikes, skateboards, scooters, etc. He said he has served as the committee's liaison to the Edmonds School District, so he has had contact with school officials as well as concerned parents. He advised that his interest is in public safety, particularly in his neighborhood on 88th Avenue where speeds are sometimes excessive. He reported that his neighborhood worked carefully with the City of Edmonds staff to develop a traffic calming program for his neighborhood, but there is still no permanent City traffic calming program in place. He referred to the proposed traffic calming element of the Transportation Plan, which is intended to help neighborhoods develop plans for slowing traffic on local streets. He noted there have been several close calls between cars and kids on his street, and it is important to address these serious safety issues.

Mr. Tibbit referred to the proposed Walkway Plan, which would be an element of the proposed Comprehensive Transportation Plan and reminded the Board that the City has deferred action on the existing walkway plan for many years, if not decades. There are currently intersections in the City that are horribly unsafe for kids, and the Transportation Committee has recommended immediate improvements on six of the most dangerous. For example, there is no sidewalk between Edmonds Way and Madrona School and children have to navigate on patches of grass and gravel within inches of moving traffic. Although these projects are identified in the current Comprehensive Transportation Plan, the City has done nothing to take care of the safety problems. Of the six most urgent projects, three of them are associated with public schools: Madrona, Sea View and Edmonds Elementary Schools.

Mr. Tibbit encouraged the City's leadership to make a case for capital improvements. The consultant and City staff have done a good job of laying the projects and programs out. An additional \$80 TBD tax would result in sufficient revenue to fund needed projects within the City. However, he said he recently suggested this concept at a party and did not receive a very favorable response from Edmonds residents who were in attendance. The concept would be difficult to sell to the citizens and would require good leadership. He encouraged the Board to exercise this leadership opportunity and help the citizens get involved.

Barbara Tipton, Edmonds, said she is also a member of the Citizens Advisory Transportation Committee. She reported that the committee has submitted a letter to the Board recommending their endorsement of the draft Comprehensive Transportation Plan as an element of the Edmonds Comprehensive Plan. She said she is also chair of the Walkway Committee, and they also support the draft plan. The Walkway Committee believes the proposed plan offers an appropriate balance between motorized and non-motorized transportation projects. The Citizens Advisory Transportation Committee's recommendation went beyond satisfying the concurrency requirement to identify safety and non-motorized projects, as well.

Ms. Tipton briefly described the methodology that was used by the Walkway Committee to prioritize walkway projects. She explained that City staff advertised for committee participants and selected a group of 12. Mr. Hauss divided the City into a grid of four sectors, and each person in the given sectors was supposed to review the walkways identified in the walkway plan that was prepared six years ago and talk to neighbors, etc to identify others. The walkway projects were then evaluated based on the following criteria: pedestrian safety, connectivity to services and facilities, completion of missing links in the walkway system, accessibility to schools and transit stops, and whether or not walkways were supported by the public. In addition to evaluating walkways, the committee solicited input at public open houses. Throughout the plan process, Mr. Hauss advertised in the local newspapers asking people to provide input, and the committee received numerous ideas for walkway priorities.

Ms. Tipton said that in addition to endorsing the plan, the Walkway Committee strongly recommends the City Council approach voters in the City with a request to increase the TBD to a total of \$100 through 2025. This increased level of funding would allow the City to implement up to 70% of the projects identified in the plan. With the current TBD of \$20, only a little more than 20% of the plan would be implemented. She advised that the Walkway Committee strongly supports the project of retrofitting sidewalks at intersections throughout the City to make them ADA compatible, but based on the

APPROVED

current funding scenario, it would take 75 years to complete the project. With the additional \$80 TBD, the project could be completed in 19 years. She noted that one member of the Walkway Committee uses a motorized wheel chair to get around town, and he provided some wonderful perspective for the committee to consider.

Ms. Tipton expressed her belief that an \$80 TBD program would restore some of the funding that was taken away with the passage of I-695. About 75% of this lost funding was used for transportation projects. She recalled that the City previously relied on the Real Estate Excise Tax (REET) to finance roadway and walkway projects. This was a viable option when the real estate market was brisk, but the City needs to have a more predictable revenue stream.

John Larpenfer, Edmonds, said he is a member of the Edmonds Bicycle Advocacy Group, but was present to represent his own point of view. He said he rides his bike most of the time to get from place to place. He has reviewed the proposed bicycle plan and was present to voice his support for a new intersection at Highway 99 and 228th Street. This project would have multiple benefits and would resolve the safety issues at 76th and Highway 99, as well. He pointed out that most bikers in the City are adults, and bicycling needs to be considered as a mode of transportation rather than a type of recreation. Improving the intersection at 228th would provide a path for people on bicycles to get from Edmonds to the east side of Highway 99 to safely connect to the Interurban Trail. He noted that bicycle projects represent only \$1.8 million of the total plan costs or less than 2%. He said he would like the City to implement as many bike improvements as possible.

Mr. Larpenfer explained that if the intersection at Highway 99 and 228th is improved, then improvements would probably be made between Highway 99 and 88th Avenue, as well. The bike lanes shown on the plan really are a misnomer because they would act as a buffer between the cars and pedestrians on the sidewalks. They would also provide a buffer for utility vehicles, transit, etc. He summarized that he supports the draft plan and would like to see the intersection project at 228th and Highway 99 become a reality.

Warren Bear, Everett, said he is vice president of the Bike Club of Snohomish County, and a number of their members live in Edmonds. He said they were approached by City staff regarding their opinion of the proposed bicycle plan, and their position is they would like the Board to forward the plan to the City Council with the recommendation that they pursue additional funding in the future such as a Transportation Benefit District and/or Business License Fee. He said he grew up in the City and has watched it grow. He said he anticipates the growth would continue, and it is important that the City consider the safety of the citizens.

Mr. Hauss thanked the Citizen Advisory Transportation Committee Members and the public for their comments. He agreed with Mr. Murray that it would be helpful to show how the proposed new plan is different than the current plan. He said he would provide this information when the plan is presented to the City Council.

THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE MEETING WAS CLOSED.

Board Member Stewart thanked the staff and consultant for adding clarifying updates since the last time the plan was presented to the Board. She also thanked the public for their thoughtful comments related to the proposed plan, and she encouraged them to continue to participate in the public process to make the Board aware of their concerns. She reminded the Board that one of the goals of the Sustainability Element of the Comprehensive Plan is to develop transportation policies, programs and regulations that are designed to support and promote sustainability. This includes taking action to reduce the use of fuel, energy and transportation and encourage alternate modes of transportation throughout the community. In addition, the City is mandated by the State and Federal Governments to reduce vehicle miles and emissions from automobiles and pollution by 2025. She noted that the greenhouse effect associated with automobiles is substantial and makes up more than 50% of the current pollution. She suggested a bit of social engineering is in order to shift the balance more towards alternative transportation, especially non-motorized. She said she likes the concept of providing a shuttle to certain parts of the City. She suggested that as neighborhoods and mixed use developments are planned, they should make sure there are ways to get to places people need to go everyday without getting into cars. This would reduce the impact on roads and reduce maintenance costs and emissions, as well.

Ms. Stewart reminded the Board that the current economy is difficult at this time, and voters will have a tough time accepting an additional \$80 assessment added to their vehicle licensing fee. Perhaps a lesser amount would be more appropriate. She

APPROVED

suggested the City consider the alternative of imposing additional taxes on vehicles based on weight, since these vehicles have more impact on the roadways. Perhaps this type of fee would help change behavior and drive the auto market to come out with smaller, more fuel efficient vehicles. If the City were to rely totally on the TBD tax, they may come up short and have to take another look at opportunities to change people's habits. She said that while the draft plan is moving in the right direction, she still has some concerns.

Board Member Reed inquired if it is imperative that the draft plan be presented to the City Council for final approval in July. Ms. Barnes explained that the Comprehensive Transportation Plan would be adopted as the transportation element of the City's Comprehensive Plan. Because they have been working on the plan for more than a year, staff made the strategic decision to move it forward to the City Council by July. However, the goal would be more of a resolution to adopt in July and the actual official adoption would take place in conjunction with all other Comprehensive Plan amendments. Staff is also looking at recommending updates to the six-year Transportation Plan in the near future, and the adopted Transportation Plan would be a necessary element in this process. Mr. Chave added that the Comprehensive Transportation Plan needs to be adopted some time this year, and it would be helpful to push it on to the City Council for approval in July because it may have some implications on the budget process which will get started in August. He noted the Board would also be working on the Sustainability Element over the next several months. Even if they forward the Transportation Plan to the City Council, they would still have the ability to revise the plan and make some suggested changes at a later date before the document is approved as part of the Comprehensive Plan amendments.

Board Member Reed inquired about the public's response regarding an additional \$80 TBD tax. Mr. Hauss said this concept was not brought up at the first two open houses, and that is why staff has proposed a third open house after the plan has been presented to the Planning Board and City Council. Staff made a decision not to present the concept to the public until after they have presented the idea to the City Council as an option.

Board Member Reed recalled that when the Board reviewed the 2006 Comprehensive Transportation Plan, Board Member Young expressed concern about the lack of funding. He noted that, as proposed, implementation of the plan would require revenue of approximately \$6.6 million per year. In 2006 before the economy collapsed, the Transportation 112 Fund identified almost \$5 million in revenue for the year. In 2007, this fund was reduced to \$700,000, and there was \$2.7 million in 2008. He noted that this averages to approximately \$4 million per year, which is not that far off of the \$6.6 yearly revenue that is identified in the proposed plan.

Vice Chair Lovell pointed out that staff's memo indicates their recommendation is that the Board forward the plan to the City Council with a recommendation that they pursue additional funding in the future such as a Transportation Benefit District and Business License Fee. He recalled that at the Board's May 27th discussion, the consensus was that they were not in favor of burdening the retailers with additional employee fees. Board Member Young suggested that the recommendation was intended to identify the two funding options that have been put on the table by the consultant and staff.

Vice Chair Lovell summarized that going from a \$20 TBD to a \$100 TBD would require a favorable vote from the public. He asked when this vote would likely take place. Mr. Hauss said the City would not likely approach the citizens regarding this option until at least April 2010. Vice Chair Lovell reminded the Board that the City Council is currently struggling with a tax levy for the City and his sense is it would take quite some work by the City Council, staff and concerned citizens to get the concept thoroughly vetted and ironed out and on the November ballot. He summarized that while he believes the plan is good, without the necessary funding it has no teeth. If the Board does not forward a recommendation related to funding, they would essentially be sending forward an empty document.

Board Member Young said he is opposed to asking the voters to approve an additional TBD tax, however much he knows it is necessary. He recalled that as a Planning Board Member, he was very pivotal in establishing a policy that anything over \$700,000 that came from REET would be used for the street overlay program. He said he agrees that maintenance is important, and using REET funding was a good idea at the time. When the Board discussed the plan a few weeks ago, they learned that the City of Edmonds received \$1 million, which will enable the City to continue their street overlay program at the same level as in the past.

Board Member Young said he is the grant coordinator for the City of Seattle's Department of Transportation. He recalled the City of Seattle administratively implemented a street utility when it was offered by the State Legislature as a funding option in the 90's, and the money was earmarked for specific projects that could be completed within the projected budget revenue. He suggested the Board recommend this same concept to the City Council. He observed that the draft Comprehensive Transportation Plan provides an excellent inventory of projects. He suggested that as they prepare the 2010 budget, the TBD and other revenue sources be put before the City Council as funding options. The City Council could choose programs to be fully funded with the additional revenue, such as non-motorized or ADA improvements. He stressed the importance of achieving completion of some visible projects before going out to the voters with a request to increase the TBD tax. He recalled that when the City of Seattle imposed street utilities, there were very few complaints and people felt the money was well spent. This approach led to successful approval of a huge transportation bond in 2007, mostly because people had seen the city deliver value for the money spent.

BOARD MEMBER YOUNG MOVED THE BOARD FORWARD THE COMPREHENSIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION THAT THEY ADOPT IT AS AN OFFICIAL STATEMENT OF TRANSPORTATION NEEDS IN THE CITY OF EDMONDS AND THAT THEY SELECT A GROUP OF PROGRAMS THEY THINK ARE THE MOST BENEFICIAL AND FUNDABLE WITHIN THE EXISTING REVENUE, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO THE CURRENT TRANSPORTATION BENEFIT DISTRICT AT THE \$20 LEVEL. BOARD MEMBER REED SECONDED THE MOTION.

Vice Chair Lovell clarified that the motion is to send the plan forward to the City Council with a recommendation that they prioritize a certain identifiable number of projects to complete in the immediate future under the current funding scenario. Board Member Young observed that non-motorized projects can be fairly manageable within the current budget projection. He said he would like the City to complete some of these projects before they go to the voters for additional funding for the larger projects. The public has indicated strong support for more sidewalks and ADA improvements.

Mr. English emphasized that the \$20 TBD that was enacted by the City Council in 2008 was earmarked specifically for public works day-to-day operations such as filling pot holes and other on-going maintenance. There is no revenue generated by the \$20 TBD for capital improvements. Board Member Young said the City Council would have to make some policy decisions about where the money would be spent. He said he would be disappointed if they interpreted the policy so narrowly that the money collected from the \$20 TBD could only be used for maintenance and operations when, in fact, any of the programs identified in the plan would be legitimate uses for the money. Again, he expressed his belief that it is important to show that some programs are getting done successfully and on time and within budget. This would open the door for the City to ask for more money from other sources.

Vice Chair Lovell pointed out that a vote to increase the TBD tax could not take place until at least April of 2010. Mr. English agreed and said he anticipates the City Council would initiate a planning process in early 2010 to look at what potential projects could be wrapped into the TBD. It would take some time to get a TBD established at any increment above the initial \$20 fee.

Board Member Stewart referred to the funding scenario examples and clarified that the current \$20 TBD assessment would provide a revenue stream of \$2.6 million per year. Ms. Barnes pointed out the current funding scenario does not include the \$20 TBD. Because it is earmarked for operations and maintenance, it was identified separately. Board Member Stewart suggested it would be helpful if the plan were to show the difference that would be had by each of the incremental additional taxes.

Board Member Clarke observed that two open houses were held to solicit public comment, but no mention was made at either about the potential of raising fees to fund the plan. Therefore, the City has no knowledge of how the public would react to the concept of increasing fees. He suggested it would be wise to get feedback from the residents rather than the Board deciding to ask for more money, particularly given the current economic environment. He suggested the motion on the table may be too limiting with respect to fundraising options. However, he agreed that if the City could identify some specific goals and projects, they would get some positive momentum going forward. He suggested the motion be changed to allow the City Council to explore all funding opportunities with the public in the future.

APPROVED

Board Member Clarke pointed out that many of the non-motorized projects identified in the Walkway Plan are a result of the way the City has grown over the years. Outside of the original boundaries of the City was very rural and the rights-of-way were narrow and did not accommodate sidewalks. Now that these areas have been annexed into the City, it is important to help the residents recognize the contributions that are required to bring the annexed areas up to standard.

Board Member Reed noted that another public open house has been scheduled for June 30th. Ms. Barnes clarified that this date is tentative and no announcement has been made. Board Member Reed observed that the open house would be followed by a presentation to the City Council. Ms. Barnes responded that one presentation would be provided to the City Council prior to the open house, and one after. Board Member Reed suggested the concept of raising the TBD by \$80 should be an option that is placed on the table for discussion at the open house. Mr. Barnes agreed that would be possible. She said the staff and consultant made the decision that the funding options should be presented to the Board and City Council before they were presented to the general public.

Vice Chair Lovell summarized that the proposed motion is to forward the plan to the City Council for action, but as part of their recommendation the Board would like to see more public input and feedback with an eye towards creating specific additional funding beyond the \$20 TBD for dedicated transportation projects. Board Member Young added that he would like to see the issue discussed in the context of how much the City can accomplish within the next few years given the current budget scenario. The City Council could identify a few projects or programs that could be accomplished within a policy driven time frame.

BOARD MEMBER YOUNG WITHDREW HIS MOTION FOR FURTHER CLARIFICATION.

BOARD MEMBER YOUNG MOVED THE BOARD FORWARD THE TRANSPORTATION PLAN TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION FOR ADOPTION WITH THE BOARD'S RECOMMENDATION THAT THE CITY COUNCIL EXAMINE IMPLEMENTATION FROM A POLICY PERSPECTIVE AND INVESTIGATE APPROPRIATE FUNDING SOURCES.

Board Member Young emphasized the Board's position that accomplishment of a program or programs would be beneficial to pursuing additional funding sources later.

BOARD MEMBER CLARKE SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 4-1, WITH BOARD MEMBER STEWART VOTING IN OPPOSITION.

THE BOARD TOOK A BREAK AT 9:10 P.M. THEY RESUMED THE MEETING AT 9:22 P.M.

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

Mr. Chave advised that the City Council Community Services/Development Services Committee discussed a possible amendment to the ECDC to allow the keeping of domestic female fowl in single-family zones at their May 12th meeting. The committee voted to forward the proposal to the Planning Board for consideration and a recommendation. He referred the Board to the proposed land use change, File Number AMD-09-7, which was prepared by Council Member Bernheim. He suggested the Board solicit feedback from Police and Animal Control since the ordinance language refers to Section 505 of the Edmonds City Code (ECC), which deals with the keeping of animals of various types. He cautioned that it is important to make sure the provisions in ECC 505 adequately cover the keeping of chickens.

Vice Chair Lovell referred to Item C on Page 2 of the draft language proposed by Council Member Bernheim, which references a Subsection B. However, Subsection B refers back to the action taken in February of 2001. Mr. Chave clarified that the provision that was approved in 2001 allowed residents who already had chickens to continue as a non-conforming use, as long as they registered with the City. Vice Chair Lovell referred to Item G of Ordinance 3655, which is the grandfather provision that was approved in June of 2007. Mr. Chave pointed out that this section could become irrelevant if an ordinance is approved to allow the keeping of hens. The language in this section would have to be eliminated or revised.

APPROVED

Board Member Clarke inquired if the grandfather provision permits residents to keep roosters. Mr. Chave answered that the grandfather provision applied to hens only. Board Member Clarke noted the importance of making the words in the proposed ordinance specific as to gender and number. He also questioned if the Board would be in favor of establishing some development standards to address setbacks, type of coop construction, etc. Mr. Chave noted that many issues are addressed in ECC 505. The purpose of the zoning code amendment is to identify the type and number of chickens that are allowed in single-family zones, and how they are kept is governed by the ECC.

Board Member Stewart inquired if the draft language would make it clear that the chickens could only be kept for their eggs. Mr. Chave answered that the proposed language would not prohibit someone from eating their hens. He suggested this would be a good question to ask Animal Control. Board Member Stewart pointed out the potential health hazards related to slaughtering chickens in residential zones.

Mr. Chave advised that the purpose of the ordinance approved by the City Council in 1999 was to confirm that the keeping of poultry and chickens was not appropriate in the City and that the use was intended to eventually go away. The proposed ordinance would be a reversal of the 1999 decision. Because most of the rules for keeping animals in the City are contained in ECC 505, it would be appropriate for the Board to seek feedback from Police and Animal Control about whether the current language would adequately address the new use. He said that while the Board is not responsible for recommending changes to the ECC, he would not recommend approval of the proposed changes to ECDC 17 unless there are sufficient rules in ECC 505 to regulate the use. If changes are needed to ECC 505, they can be brought forward to the City Council as a separate item at the same time the proposed amendment to ECDC 17 is presented.

Board Member Young said his only reservation about recommending approval of the draft ordinance is that he doesn't want to unnecessarily burden the Animal Control or Code Enforcement Officers. Mr. Chave explained that the Code Enforcement Officer could address the Board about whether or not the use should be allowed by the zoning code. However, he would not be involved in animal control issues. How animals are kept should be addressed as a separate issue.

Board Member Stewart said she would like to know more about the conditions necessary for keeping hens. Both indoor and outdoor space should be required. She said she would hope the ECC could provide some general guidelines without burdening the regulatory staff. She summarized that people need to be aware of what is and is not appropriate. She also suggested it would be helpful to check with the Department of Health to learn more about what is required to ensure conditions are sanitary. Board Member Reed pointed out there are numerous examples from other jurisdictions that staff could use as a guide to create formal code language.

Board Member Clarke suggested it might be helpful to invite Animal Control to attend the public hearing to provide their thoughts on the use. This would allow the public an opportunity to comment, as well. The Board could take the matter up after listening to the issues raised by the public, staff and Animal Control. Mr. Chave agreed that would be one reasonable approach.

Vice Chair Lovell questioned if it is fair to say that in order to be sustainable the City should allow people to raise hens. He questioned if a more sustainable approach would be to purchase organic eggs from local merchants. He summarized his belief that the Board does not have near enough information to make a competent decision at this time.

Mr. Chave agreed to contact Animal Control and invite them to forward the appropriate sections of the ECC for the Board's review. Staff could develop some history in Edmonds regarding registered chickens, as well. He suggested a representative from Police and Animal Control be invited to the Board's next meeting for a discussion prior to a public hearing. Board Member Young agreed that would be appropriate since most of his concerns are related to regulatory burden rather than whether or not hens are appropriate in Edmonds.

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

Vice Chair Lovell reviewed that the Board's June 24th meeting agenda would include a discussion with Jennifer Grand, previous Edmonds Economic Development Director, regarding sustainability and economic development. In addition, Stephen Clifton, Community Services Director, would be present to discuss transportation land use opportunities in the

downtown/waterfront area. A representative from Animal Control would be invited to have a short discussion at the beginning of the meeting, as well. The Board agreed it would be helpful for Animal Control to provide as much written information as possible prior to the meeting.

Board Member Clarke announced that the park near the Woodway Elementary School is nearing completion, and a grand opening is scheduled for August 8th. He inquired if the park naming process would be completed by that date. Mr. Chave referred the Board to the memorandum from Brian McIntosh, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director, regarding the park naming process. He noted that, at some point, the Board is required to conduct a public hearing and make a recommendation to the City Council. He said he would ask Mr. McIntosh to communicate with the Board about the timeline for the process.

Board Member Reed referred to the approved process for adopting a new park name, which requires the Board to hold a public hearing to review all of the submitted names. He suggested that Mr. McIntosh be asked to group the names into categories for the Board to begin prioritizing. After the public hearing the Board could narrow the list down and make a recommendation to the City Council.

The Board discussed the short amount of time available to complete the park naming process prior to the grand opening of the park. They emphasized their desire to have a name selected prior to the park opening.

The Board selected a subcommittee (Board Members Reed, Stewart and Clarke) to identify the top ten names. They agreed to conduct a public hearing, after which they would narrow the list to three and forward a recommendation to the City Council. The Board Members were invited to email their ideas and thoughts to the subcommittee members.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

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

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

None of the Commissioners provided comments during this portion of the meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The Board meeting was adjourned at 9:55 p.m.

APPROVED