

**CITY OF EDMONDS
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

September 22, 2010

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

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Philip Lovell, Chair
John Reed, Vice Chair
Todd Cloutier
Kristiana Johnson
Valerie Stewart

STAFF PRESENT

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager
Rob English, City Engineer
Brian McIntosh, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director
Jerry Shuster, Stormwater Engineer Program Manager
Bertrand Hauss, Traffic Engineer
Gina Coccia, Planner
Karin Noyes, Recorder

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT

Kevin Clarke

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Board Member Johnson noted that the term “TBD Tax” was used throughout the September 8th minutes, yet the correct term is “TBD fee.” She explained that there is a significant difference between a tax and a fee. For example, the City’ receives gasoline excise tax, but they also have certain fees such as utility fees and a fee to use Yost Pool. It is in that regard that the Transportation Benefit District (TBD) charge is a fee and not a tax. It is not a requirement, but is based on the number of vehicles a person owns. She asked that the minutes be changed accordingly.

VICE CHAIR REED MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 8, 2010 BE APPROVED AS AMENDED. BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

No changes were made to the agenda.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS

No one in the audience expressed a desire to address the Board during this portion of the meeting.

REPORT ON ADULT ENTERTAINMENT SITES

Ms. Coccia explained that in 1995 the City adopted ECDC 16.60.015, which regulates the location of sexually-oriented businesses (Adult Entertainment) in the City. As per code, the businesses are only permitted to locate within the General Commercial (CG) and General Commercial 2 (CG2) zones, which are primarily located along Highway 99. The main determinate of where these businesses can locate is based on their proximity to specific protected uses. As written, there must be a 300-foot separation from any residential or public use zone, as well as from parks, libraries, churches, community centers, museums or hospitals. In addition, a 500-foot separation is required from bars and taverns. She referred to the following maps provided in the Staff Report:

- An updated map of buffers and potential sites for adult entertainment dated September 2010
- A map of buffers and potential sites for adult entertainment dated April 2006
- An original map of buffers and potential sites for adult entertainment dated October 1996

Ms. Coccia reported that after reviewing recent licenses issued by the Washington State Liquor Control Board for properties along Highway 99, staff found that no new ones have been issued since 2006, which means there has been no decrease in the area available for adult entertainment uses. She summarized that based on the criteria in ECDC 16.60.015, there were approximately 20 potential locations for adult entertainment businesses when the ordinance was adopted in 1996. In 2006 it was estimated there were approximately 19 to 20 potential locations. Since that time, the only change noted was that the Scott's Bar and Grill site was incorrectly placed because the address provided by the Washington State Liquor Control Board was incorrect. When this site is moved to its actual location, the buffer would move approximately 230 feet west. This would eliminate some of the potential area on the site that currently contains the Campbell Nelson car dealership. Other than that, there have been no new protected classes from which to buffer so the amount of potential business locations remains the same. She concluded that staff is not recommending any changes in the zoning regulations at this time. However, the number of available locations will need to be continually monitored during the coming years.

Vice Chair Reed asked if the commercial zones at Firdale Village and/or Harbor Square would be impacted by ECDC 16.60.015. Ms. Coccia answered that the commercial zones at Firdale Village are actually Mixed-Use (MU). Adult entertainment uses are only permitted in CG and CG2 zones. Harbor Square is under a contract rezone at this time. However, if future changes are proposed for Harbor Square zoning, ECDC 16.60.015 should be part of the consideration.

Mr. Chave clarified that the Board is not being asked to take action on this item. The purpose of the discussion is for staff to report on the status of the ordinance. Periodic checks are done to make sure there are still adequate sites available for this use to ensure the City is in compliance with State Law.

Chair Lovell pointed out that some of the orange areas, which identify where adult entertainment uses could potentially locate, are close to the high school. Mr. Chave replied that the orange areas indicate properties where the use would be allowed based on current code requirements for buffers.

PUBLIC HEARING ON EMERGENCY TEMPORARY INDOOR SHELTERS ORDINANCE

Chair Lovell reviewed the rules and procedures for legislative public hearings.

Ms. Coccia reviewed that the City Council first discussed the concept of temporary indoor shelters in 2009 and adopted an interim ordinance; the Board started working on a permanent ordinance in February of 2010. She explained that the City Attorney drafted the ordinance based on the new House Bill 19.56 and ECDC 19.00.040, incorporating specific language as required by the State. The only change the City Attorney made since the last time the Board reviewed the draft language was inserting the interim ordinance numbers that were previously left blank. She referred to the draft ordinance (Attachment 12), which would adopt a new Chapter ECDC 17.105 to define emergency temporary homeless shelters and identify zoning districts where they are permitted. It would repeal Ordinance Numbers 3730, 3769 and 3794, and would potentially allow organizations such as churches to open their doors to homeless people when the temperature drops below 32 degrees.

Ms. Coccia advised that staff used previous City Council and Planning Board meeting minutes to identify individuals who have participated in previous discussions about temporary indoor shelters, and notices were sent inviting them to attend the public hearing. In addition, notices were posted in the normal locations, and in the local newspaper. Staff recommends the Board forward a recommendation of approval to the City Council.

Vice Chair Reed referred to Ordinance 3778 (Attachment 3), which added a new Section ECDC 19.00.040 to exclude churches providing emergency housing for the indigent from certain code requirements. He asked if this ordinance has been permanently adopted into the ECDC. Ms. Coccia answered affirmatively.

APPROVED

Board Member Johnson asked if the recommended changes based on the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) were reflected in the draft ordinance. Ms. Coccia answered that these changes had been incorporated into the language prior to the Board's last discussion (See Items 1, 2 and 3 in ECDC 17.105.020.B).

John Rutter, Edmonds, said he is present as a member of a local church group that has been unable to help people who were in desperate need because their building does not meet certain code requirements. He expressed appreciation to the staff and Planning Board for considering their need and desire to get people off the streets when it is really cold. He encouraged the Board to approve the ordinance. He concluded by stating that he is a member of the Social Action/Social Concern Committee of the Edmonds Unitarian Universal Church.

Merrie Emmons, Edmonds, expressed appreciation to the Board for considering the proposed ordinance and encouraged them to move it forward for approval. She referenced ECDC 19.00.040, which would require a church to maintain a fire watch. She asked if this means someone from the church must be awake all night. She noted that this is a difficult requirement since most church volunteers have to work the next day. Mr. Chave emphasized that the draft ordinance does not specifically require a fire watch. This must be worked out with the Fire Marshall on a case-by-case basis during the permit process. Ms. Emmons said it is very important that emergency temporary indoor shelters be allowed in Edmonds.

Board Member Johnson asked how many beds Ms. Emmons' church provided during the past winter. Ms. Emmons answered that they have the ability to provide 12 beds, but they were not able to do so last year because their building did not meet the fire code requirements.

Ms. Coccia referred to ECDC 19.00.040.2.b, which defines the term "fire watch" to mean "the maintenance during all times when indigent housing services are provided of a watch by paid staff or volunteers who shall, on premises, monitor for fires or violations of no smoking provisions. At least one fire monitor shall be provided for each eight persons housed."

THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE HEARING WAS CLOSED.

BOARD MEMBER CLOUTIER MOVED THAT THE BOARD FORWARD THE DRAFT ORDINANCE ADOPTING A NEW CHAPTER 17.105 TO THE EDMONDS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE (ECDC) REGARDING EMERGENCY TEMPORARY HOMELESS SHELTERS TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL AS PRESENTED. BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Chave explained that the draft ordinance would be moved forward to the City Council for a public hearing and final approval. Those who received notice of the Planning Board hearing would also receive notice of the City Council hearing. Others who want to receive notification can add their name to the mailing list by signing up at the back of the room.

PUBLIC HEARING ON TEMPORARY HOMELESS ENCAMPMENT ORDINANCE

Ms. Coccia advised that the proposed ordinance would adopt a new chapter 17.20 to the Edmonds Community Development Code (ECDC) related to temporary homeless encampment permits. She noted that, at this time, the City has no regulations related to temporary homeless encampments. The proposed ordinance would create a permanent process, and control the frequency, duration and conditions. She advised that, as written, a public hearing would be required, as would buffers from residential neighborhoods. She explained that the initial draft ordinance was crafted by the City Attorney based on ordinances adopted by other jurisdictions in the area. The Planning Board held discussions on February 24th and August 25th and recommended changes, which are reflected in the draft ordinance (Attachment 1) currently before the Board for consideration. It specifically addresses the following questions that were raised on August 25th:

- Does the City have the ability to prohibit weapons in temporary homeless encampments?
- What is the appropriate buffer from residential neighborhoods?
- Should minors under the age of 18 be allowed if accompanied by a parent or guardian?

APPROVED

Ms. Coccia explained that once the Board has formulated their recommendation, the ordinance would be forwarded to the City Council for a public hearing and final approval. She advised that there is a sign-up sheet available for those interested in receiving notification of the City Council hearing.

Chair Lovell summarized that it appears all of the Board's questions and comments have been addressed in the ordinance. He specifically noted the change in ECDC 17.20.050.A, which alters the permit period from 30 to 45 days. He recalled the Board felt this was a more reasonable amount of time to allow the public an opportunity to provide comments.

NO ONE IN THE AUDIENCE INDICATED A DESIRE TO PARTICIPATE IN THE PUBLIC HEARING. THEREFORE, THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE HEARING WAS CLOSED.

VICE CHAIR REED MOVED THAT THE BOARD FORWARD THE DRAFT ORDINANCE ADOPTING A NEW CHAPTER 17.20 TO THE EDMONDS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE (ECDC) RELATING TO TEMPORARY HOMELESS ENCAMPMENT PERMITS AND FREQUENCY, DURATION AND CONDITIONS TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL AS PRESENTED. BOARD MEMBER CLOUTIER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

PUBLIC HEARING ON CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN (2011 – 2016)

Mr. English noted that no one was present in the audience to participate in the public hearing, and staff provided a lengthy presentation on the Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) to the Board on September 8th. He suggested, and the Board agreed, that staff should dispense with another lengthy presentation and focus on the following questions and issues that were raised previously by the Board:

- *As requested by the Board, a PowerPoint presentation was electronically forwarded to each Board Member. The Board Members indicated they all received the document.*
- *The 100-Year Flood Plain Study of the Edmonds Marsh was incorrectly labeled. Mr. English advised that this has been corrected in the latest version of the CFP.*
- *Rather than indicating that facilities are reaching the end of their useful life and need to be replaced," the Board suggested it would be more appropriate to use the term "are in need of major renovation and replacement." This would allow the City to consider all options. Mr. English reported that the change was made for every project, with the exception of the Senior Center. Staff believes the existing structure is in such poor condition that renovation costs would far outweigh replacement costs.*
- *Why was funding identified for the Edmonds Crossing Project? Mr. English noted that Mr. Clifton responded via email to the Board Members, and he did not receive any additional questions as a result of his email.*
- *Is it possible to identify incremental improvements to existing structures (i.e. ADA improvements at the Boys and Girls Club)? Mr. English explained that the City currently leases the Boys and Girls Club Building from the Edmonds School District for \$1 per year, and the current lease does not expire until 2021. He said the Building Maintenance Supervisor has observed that, in light of the City's limited capital improvement funding, it would not be prudent to spend a significant amount to improve a building that is now owned by the City. Mr. McIntosh added that when the Boys and Girls Club is replaced or relocated in the future, the fundraising campaign would be under the direction of the Boys and Girls Club of Snohomish County. The siting of the new facility will fall under their jurisdictions, as well.*
- *Can the arts center be located in a leased building rather than waiting for funding to construct a new building? Mr. English advised that Ms. Chapin indicated that the City and potential partners have discussed this opportunity and they believe it is a viable option. However, no decisions would be made until there is funding to move the project forward.*

Mr. English referred the Board to the pie charts provided by staff to summarize information contained in the 2009 Transportation Comprehensive Plan regarding project costs and revenue sources. He reviewed each of the anticipated project category expenditures, which result in a total cost of \$105,500,000 through 2025. He also reviewed the anticipated revenue sources through 2025 as follows:

- Unsecured grants (\$12 million) – This number was based on the City's previous track record of securing grant funding.
- Secured grants (\$1 million) – This number represents grant funding the City currently has in hand.

APPROVED

- Traffic Impact Fees (\$6.5 million) – This number was projected by the Transportation Comprehensive Plan consultant.
- Real Estate Excise Tax (REET) (\$4 million) – The City’s current policy is that all REET Funds in excess of \$750,000 per year are transferred to transportation projects. However, with the down economy, this threshold has not been met for the last three years.
- Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax (\$2 million) – This is the most consistent and reliable source of funding for transportation projects. However, the largest portion of fuel tax collected is placed in the transportation maintenance fund. Only \$125,000 per year is placed in the transportation capital fund each year.
- Other local funds (\$6 million) – This number includes potential funding when walkway and utility projects overlap with transportation projects.
- Snohomish County for 84th Avenue West (\$8 million) – This project should move forward sometime within the 20-year planning period, and the City anticipates they would be able to collect money from Snohomish County to help pay for the project.

Mr. English summarized that anticipated revenue sources equal \$60,500,000, which leaves a shortfall of \$66,000,000 or about 62%. He emphasized that the revenue source numbers do not include any Transportation Benefit District (TBD) revenue associated with the proposal to increase the fee by \$40. Staff discussed the option of including graphics in the Capital Facilities Plan to clearly illustrate the anticipated shortfall. However, they chose not to make this change because the TBD Board has not decided how to disperse the additional money collected. They can decide to either bond for projects up front or disperse the money based on annual revenue. The proposed increase of \$40 would result in approximately \$1 million of additional revenue per year. By 2025, the City would have an additional \$15 million for transportation projects. The amount of revenue through 2025 would increase significantly if the TBD Board decided to bond for a large portion of the revenue and have debt service that extends beyond 2025.

Vice Chair Reed asked where the numbers on the pie charts could be found in the proposed CFP. Mr. English answered that the numbers came from the 2009 Transportation Comprehensive Plan. A large number of projects included in the Transportation Comprehensive Plan are also identified in the CFP. However, overlay projects (\$27,200,000) are not identified in the CFP because they are considered maintenance projects. The overlay project costs assume an annual expenditure of \$1.7 million, which represents a 20-year cycle for arterials and a 30-year cycle for collector and residential streets. As per Proposition 1, half of the additional \$40 fee (about \$500,000 per year) would be used to fund overlay projects, but the Transportation Comprehensive Plan identifies \$1.7 million as the amount needed to adequately fund the overlay program. He summarized that while the \$500,000 obtained from the additional TBD fee would be much welcomed, it would not provide enough funding for the City to properly maintain their streets on a 20-year overlay cycle.

In response to Vice Chair Reed’s question about grant funding, Mr. English announced that the City was recently notified that they would receive two additional transportation grants to design the 228th Street/Highway 99 corridor improvements and to install new pedestrian lighting on both sides of Main Street between 5th and 6th Avenues. Mr. Hauss clarified that the \$1 million identified in the pie chart for secured grant funding includes the 228th Street project grant, but not the Main Street project grant. He explained that the \$12 million identified in the pie chart as unsecured grant funding was based on the City’s five-year history for securing transportation grants and matches what was identified in the Transportation Comprehensive Plan in 2009, she explained that obtaining grants typically requires the City to have matching funds. If the City does not have local money to service the match, their opportunities are more limited. The more local match the City can offer, the higher their score when competing with other cities in the region. Board Member Johnson asked if the City has lost grant opportunities because they did not have matching funds. Mr. English said he cannot say they have lost grant funding for this reason, but staff has decided not to pursue grant opportunities because no local match was available.

Chair Lovell said the proposed CFP appears to be well organized, but there is no money to fund its implementation. He questioned how they can call it a plan if there is no funding. It should be called “a dream.” He particularly expressed concern that there is insufficient funding for overlay projects. He asked staff to share their insight about how much more it would cost the City to entirely replace a street in 10 years if necessary because the appropriate maintenance was not done. Mr. English noted that not only do the streets deteriorate if they are not maintained properly, they eventually reach a point where they can no longer be preserved. It is important to keep in mind that the cost difference between preservation and total rehabilitation is significant. If nothing is done in 10 years, the City will start seeing more and more streets fall into the

category of needing total rehabilitation and the costs will continue to escalate. Board Member Johnson recalled that Mr. Hauss previously provided illustrations showing how much the cost of fixing roads goes up as their condition worsens. She suggested this information should be attached to the CFP when it is presented to the City Council. Mr. Hauss reminded the Board that it costs approximately four times more to replace a road as it does to maintain it.

Board Member Johnson asked staff to explain the life expectancy of a road compared to the City's current overlay cycle. Mr. Hauss answered that the City is currently funding an 80 to 100-year overlay cycle. Mr. English added that, typically, cities try to maintain a 20-year overlay cycle.

Board Member Stewart asked if there is new technology that results in longer-lasting overlays. Mr. English said he does not know of a material or application that extends the life of an overlay beyond 20 years. However, new technology is emerging that makes the overlay process more sustainable. For example, the top two inches of existing pavement can be ground up and new oil added the mixture so it can then be reused. However, this process has somewhat limited application in the State of Washington. In addition, the City of Seattle currently uses a low-temperature mix that requires less energy and effort to apply.

Board Member Stewart commended staff for preparing the draft document and incorporating their previous suggestions wherever possible. She asked who is responsible for renegotiating the lease for the Boys and Girls Club building. She also asked if the building is identified on the Edmonds Register of Historic Places, which may improve the chances of obtaining grant funding for rehabilitation. Mr. English clarified that the CFP does not indicate the building would be demolished. The Boys and Girls Club of Snohomish County would initiate the process for determining whether it is appropriate to relocate their program or replace and/or renovate their existing location. This decision has not yet been made. Board Member Stewart expressed her hope that the citizens would be invited to participate in this decision. Mr. McIntosh said the building was constructed in the 1930's, but it has not been placed on the Edmonds Register of Historic Places. He reminded the Board that the City does not have a lot of control over this building because it is owned by the Edmonds School District. There have been discussions with the school district to make sure the property stays in public hands but they are not interested in negotiating at this time. If and when the land and building eventually become part of City property, the City would have more influence on what happens to the property.

Board Member Cloutier observed that even if the additional TBD fee is approved by voters, there would still be a massive shortfall in the transportation budget. He questioned how the Board could support a transportation plan that has more projects than can be funded. He suggested they reduce the list of projects to only those that can be funded with projected revenues. He pointed out that, as currently drafted, the City's wants and needs are all "stirred into one pot." For example, the overlay program is a need; and if it is not done, the costs will continue to go up. It does not seem right to place this program into the same pot as sidewalk projects, which will not result in additional costs if they are not done in the immediate future. Mr. English advised that the list of 37 projects to be funded by the additional \$40 TBD fee was developed by the TBD Board (City Council).

Chair Lovell recalled that when the Board discussed the concept of raising the TBD fee, they were presented with information showing how the overlay program would be impacted based on various TBD fee levels. Mr. English said the matrix provided by staff outlined what the City would get from the incremental increases in the TBD fee. Chair Lovell felt this information was very helpful in helping the Board understand how the overlay cycle would be impacted. It is important for the public to understand that if they do not do something to get closer to a 20-year overlay cycle, major reconstruction will be required to bring the roads up to an acceptable standard in the future.

Board Member Cloutier noted that the proposed CFP does not identify the cost increases that would occur if the City does not adequately fund their overlay program. These costs will not go away, and in fact, will get even higher. He said he cannot support moving the CFP forward without adequate funding for the overlay program.

Board Member Johnson said she participated on the Transportation Committee that helped develop the Transportation Comprehensive Plan. She explained that the City is required by the Growth Management Act (GMA) to forecast their transportation needs for the next 20 years. Through this exercise, they identified all of transportation needs through 2025. She noted that some projects were for safety and others were related to sidewalks and bikeways. Through a forecast, a

APPROVED

volunteer committee surveyed all of the streets in Edmonds and evaluated the need for sidewalks on a rating system. The Transportation Comprehensive Plan also addresses the issue of capacity and concurrency. In order to plan for future traffic growth, the City had to establish a level of service standard, project future population and employment growth, and determine where the growth would occur. Growth was measured against the level of service standard to identify future problems. She emphasized that if a level of service problem cannot be addressed within six years, no new development projects can be approved for that area. She said the level of service standard also helped the City establish a traffic impact fee program.

Board Member Stewart expressed concern that the concurrency standard approach assumes that the residents of the City will remain car dependent in the future. If they work to improve pedestrian and bicycle access and transit service, the concurrency standards will need to be adjusted in the future to reflect this more sustainable approach. She said she is disappointed that, at this time, it appears that most of the funding will go to roadway improvements. She suggested that roadways would last longer as people start to use other modes of transportation. The City must take the appropriate steps to create these options. Board Member Johnson said it is possible to change the level of service standard; however, until a change is made, the plan must be based on the adopted level of service standard.

Vice Chair Reed clarified that the CFP, which is currently before the Board for consideration, does not include the overlay program. The overlay program is identified in the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), which is not a subject of the current public hearing. He said he assumes that every project on the list needs to be done. He asked who would be responsible for finding the necessary funding to implement the plan. Mr. English answered that staff would pursue grant funding and other revenue sources would be the City Council's responsibility. Staff would pursue projects as funding becomes available.

Vice Chair Reed asked if the Transportation Committee talked about the funding shortfall as part of their discussions related to the Transportation Comprehensive Plan. Mr. English answered that they provided recommendations to the TBD Board regarding the proposal to increase the TBD fee by \$40. The chair of the committee also spoke before the Planning Board several times to outline the project needs. In addition, they were involved in discussions related to potential funding sources.

THERE WAS NO ONE IN THE AUDIENCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THE PUBLIC HEARING SO THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Chair Lovell commented that staff has done a fabulous job providing a lot of detail in the plan. However, it is difficult for the Board to forward the document to the City Council for adoption when there is insufficient funding to implement the identified projects. Board Member Cloutier said he would not be in favor of forwarding the draft CFP to the City Council with such a significant funding shortfall. He suggested they prioritize the projects in the plan and only include those that can be funded with anticipated revenue. The plan should include a balanced budget.

Mr. English explained that the \$105,500,000 total cost projection include both capital projects and maintenance. He emphasized that the CFP only deals with capital facilities projects such as sidewalks, bikeways and concurrency projects. While the additional TBD fee proposed in Proposition 1 would not make up the entire shortfall through 2025, it would provide a revenue stream for them to accomplish at least some of the projects on the list. The overlay program is identified in the CIP not the CFP, and the Board is not being asked to take action on the CIP at this time. Board Member Cloutier said he understands the difference between the CFP and the CIP, but the TBD fee is only one revenue source among many. The TBD fee will not provide sufficient funding for all the projects identified in the CIP and the CFP. Moving forward with projects identified in the CFP will prevent the City from accomplishing all of the maintenance identified in the CIP.

Mr. Chave reminded the Board that the CFP has specific legal requirements attached to it and the CIP is more driven by priorities and government funding. The City is required to have an adopted CFP that has certain funding requirements. If they do not have a CFP that supports their planning policies and standards, they must reevaluate their policies. This would be a time-consuming and costly process. He recommended the Board forward the CFP to the City Council with a recommendation of approval as an interim solution. They could revisit the CIP and its relationship to the CFP at a later date. However, there would be serious repercussions associated with holding up approval of the CFP.

APPROVED

Mr. English explained that the projects identified in the Transportation Comprehensive Plan were prioritized based on criteria in the plan. The TBD Board also used the criteria to further refine the list. The list of 37 projects on the ballot initiative identify what the TBD Board prefers to see as priorities.

Mr. Chave recalled that when the Transportation Comprehensive Plan was last updated in 2009, the Board had some discussion about taking a more multi-modal approach the next time the plan is updated. He felt this would be a worthwhile effort given the City's efforts to become more sustainable. He noted that this concept is also addressed in the Community Sustainability Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

Board Member Cloutier said he understands the Board cannot modify the CFP to make it fit the budget. He also understands that they must have an approved CFP. However, he suggested that as they move the document forward to the City Council, they should include a clear statement that there is no expectation that all the projects identified in the plan can be implemented. Vice Chair Reed agreed that the Board should send a clear message to the City Council that the plan is minimally funded the way it is currently structured.

Vice Chair Reed said it was reported on myedmondsnews.com that the City Council approved two transportation projects to move forward. Mr. English reported that the City Council approved the Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) as proposed by staff, but they added \$50,000 for traffic calming projects in 2011. However, they did not approve any specific transportation projects to move forward at this time. Vice Chair Reed asked if the TIP approved by the City Council identified the two recent grants. Mr. English answered that grant funding for the 228th/Highway 99 Intersection Improvements was identified in the TIP, but not the grant funding for the Main Street lighting program. He explained that once the City receives an official letter from PSRC stating that the grant has been approved, the TIP would be adjusted accordingly.

Chair Lovell recommended the Board forward the CFP to the City Council with the advisory that they discuss and thoroughly understand and assimilate that the gap between needs and funding is highly dependent on increased focus on prioritization. At some point the City Council will have to find a large source of funding in order to catch reality up with the plan.

BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON MOVED TO FORWARD THE CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL AS WRITTEN. VICE CHAIR REED SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

DISCUSSION ON POTENTIAL OF HAVING A STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE

Board Member Stewart reported that the Spring 2010 edition of *THE COMMISSIONER*, published by the American Planning Association, contained a good article about establishing a student representative on the Planning Board. She provided a handout outlining the reasons for involving youth and things the Board should consider as they develop a program. She invited the Board Members to share their comments and ideas. If they are in favor of pursuing the program, she offered to spend more time developing the details.

Chair Lovell pointed out that the ordinance establishing the Planning Board identifies seven members and one alternate. Therefore, it may be necessary to change the ordinance to add a student representative. Mr. Chave said he has requested feedback from the City Attorney about whether or not this change would require a code amendment. If the Board decides to add a student representative, he strongly urged them not to make the student a voting member. In addition, the student may have different roles in quasi-judicial versus legislative issues. He noted that the City Council appoints student representatives on a short-term basis since it is not feasible to expect a student to commit to the position long term. This creates an interesting situation because many of the issues that come before the Board are long-term projects, and the student representatives may not sit on the Board long enough to see them completed. He agreed that encouraging student participation in local government is a laudable goal.

Board Member Johnson said she supports the idea of getting students involved in local government, but she questioned how interested high school students would be in the Board's activities. She suggested that perhaps the University of Washington

APPROVED

and Edmonds Community College should be approached about the idea of offering college credit for students who participate on the Board. Board Member Stewart said she likes the idea of expanding the program to include college students, but she did not want to exclude high school students. Board Member Johnson asked if there should be a residency requirement. Board Member Lovell noted that the University of Washington's College of Urban Planning requires their students to have internships, and this program could be a potential resource for student representatives. He agreed with Board Member Johnson that a high school student might find it difficult to assimilate the issues that come before the Board. Board Member Stewart pointed out that this issue could be addressed by formulating clear requirements for the position.

Board Member Stewart agreed to research the City Council's process for appointing student representatives. She would also seek additional information from the American Planning Association. Chair Lovell offered his assistance. The Board agreed to continue their discussion when more information is available.

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

Board Member Reed observed that the extended agenda indicates a public hearing on wireless telecommunication facilities is scheduled for October 13th. However, the Board previously agreed to continue their discussion on October 13th, with a public hearing tentatively scheduled for November 10th. He also noted that the October 13th agenda should include a discussion regarding interior lot lines overlapping PRD perimeter buffers in preparation for the public hearing that is scheduled for October 27th.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

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

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Board Member Stewart announced that the Northwest Eco Building Guild is sponsoring an event at the Seattle Public Library on Friday, September 24th at 6:30 p.m. titled "10 Projects x 10 Slides x 10 Minutes. It is intended to be a high-energy presentation of the 10 most exciting sustainable building projects in and around Seattle.

Board Member Cloutier announced that the Sustainable Energy Retrofit Program will have its kick off event on Wednesday, September 29th at 7:00 p.m. at the Edmonds Community College Woodway Building Room 202. The event is open to any home owner or home occupier in Edmonds and Lynnwood. People will be able to sign up to participate in the program. Mr. Chave noted that staff worked with Sustainable Edmonds to send out 2,000 postcards advertising the event. Board Member Cloutier added that volunteers from Sustainable Edmonds also distributed 2,000 door hangers last Saturday, and they plan to do the same this Saturday.

Board Member Johnson thanked Mr. Clugston for putting together the map and list of all the wireless facilities in Edmonds. She reported that she and Board Member Stewart visited nearly all of the sites. However, one of the addresses seemed to be incorrect and another was incorrectly labeled. They were unable to locate the Seaview pole, but not at the address given. Ms. Coccia said she noticed this mistake, as well. She explained that the pole is located within the right-of-way. Because there are no addresses for right-of-way locations, the closest address to the facility was used

Board Member Johnson cautioned that because the Board is short a few members at this time, it is important to ensure there is a quorum present at each of their meetings. Vice Chair Reed pointed out that four Board Members are needed to constitute a quorum.

ADJOURNMENT

The Board meeting was adjourned at 9:04 p.m.

APPROVED