

**CITY OF EDMONDS
TRANSPORTATION BENEFIT DISTRICT BOARD
APPROVED MINUTES
June 22, 2010**

The Edmonds Transportation Benefit District meeting was called to order at 6:04 p.m. by Board President Steve Bernheim in the Council Chambers, 250 5th Avenue North, Edmonds.

OFFICIALS PRESENT

Steve Bernheim, Board President
Strom Peterson, Board Vice President
D. J. Wilson, Board Member (arrived 6:06 p.m.)
Michael Plunkett, Board Member
Adrienne Fraley-Monillas, Board Member
Diane Buckshnis, Board Member

STAFF PRESENT

Stephen Clifton, Community Services/Economic
Development Director
Noel Miller, Public Works Director
Bertrand Hauss, Transportation Engineer
Sandy Chase, City Clerk
Jana Spellman, Senior Executive Council Asst.
Jeannie Dines, Recorder

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

BOARD MEMBER BUCKSHNIS MOVED, SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER FRALEY-MONILLAS, TO APPROVE THE AGENDA IN CONTENT AND ORDER. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. (Board Member Wilson was not present for the vote.)

2. CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

BOARD MEMBER PLUNKETT MOVED, SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER FRALEY-MONILLAS, TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA. MOTION CARRIED (4-0-1), BOARD VICE PRESIDENT PETERSON ABSTAINED. (Board Member Wilson was not present for the vote. Board Vice President Peterson explained he was not present for the 05-04-10 TBD Meeting and therefore abstained from voting on the approval of the minutes.) The agenda items approved are as follows:

A. ROLL CALL

B. APPROVAL OF TRANSPORTATION BENEFIT DISTRICT BOARD MEETING MINUTES OF MAY 4, 2010.

3. PUT POSSIBLE \$70 INCREASE IN TBD LICENSE FEES TO A PUBLIC VOTE DURING THE NOVEMBER 2010 GENERAL ELECTION

Transportation Engineer Bertrand Hauss reviewed the list of priority projects presented at the May 4 TBD Meeting. Mr. Hauss explained with a \$20 TBD fee, the TBD is collecting approximately \$500,000 per year or approximately \$5 million over the next 10 years.

Rank	Project Name	Project Type
Projects funded via a \$20 License Fee Option - collect \$500,000 per year or \$5 million over 10 years;		
1	Street Overlay/Resurfacing (\$500,000/year)	Overlay
Projects funded via a \$40 License Fee Option – collect \$1 million per year or \$10 million over 10 years:		
2	Main Street @ 3 rd Signal Upgrade	Safety
3	212 th @ 84 th / Five Corners Intersection Improvements	Concurrency 2009
4	234 th Street SW / 236 th Street SW (#1 long walkway)	Walkway
5	Bicycle Loop signing	Bicycle
6	Main Street @ 94 th Avenue W Signal Installation	Concurrency 2009
7	2 nd Avenue S (#1 short walkway)	Walkway
8	Citywide Traffic Calming Program	Maintenance
9	Dayton Street (#2 short walkway)	Walkway
Projects funded via a \$60 License Fee Option – collect \$1.5 million per year or \$15 million over 10 years:		
10	212 th @ 76 th W Intersection Improvements	Concurrency 2015
11	100 th @ 238 th Upgrades	Maintenance
12	Maple Street (#3 short walkway)	Walkway
13	Maplewood Drive (#2 long walkway)	Walkway
14	Walnut Street (#4 short walkway)	Walkway
15	220 th Street SW @ 76 th Intersection Improvements	Concurrency 2015
16	Walnut Street @ 9 th Avenue W Intersection Improvement	Concurrency 2009
17	Meadowdale Beach Road (#4 long walkway)	Walkway
Projects funded via a \$80 License Fee Option – collect \$2 million per year or \$20 million over 10 years:		
18	228 th Street SW Corridor Improvements / Hwy. 99 @ 76 th Intersection Improvements	Safety
19	80 th Avenue W / 180 th Street SW Walkway (#7 long walkway)	Walkway
Additional projects:		
20	Olympic View Drive @ 76 th Avenue W Intersection Improvements	Concurrency 2015
21	Walnut Street (#5 short walkway)	Walkway
22	Caspers @ 9 th Avenue W	Concurrency 2015
23	238 th Street SW walkway (#9 long walkway)	Walkway
24	84 th Avenue W (212 th Street SW to 238 th Street SW)	Safety/Walkway

Mr. Hauss explained if the City acquired grant funding over the next 10 years for some projects, the funds collected via the license fee would be used to fund the additional projects on the list. He identified 2009 and 2015 concurrency projects, explaining to be identified as a concurrency project the location has a level of service below the City's accepted level of service standard of D. For example 212th @ 84th /Five Corners intersection is currently at a LOS F, Main Street @ 9th Avenue W is at a LOS F, and 212th @ 76th Avenue W is a LOS D but projected to be LOS F by 2015.

Mr. Hauss explained for the intersection improvements at Main @ 9th and Walnut @ 9th an interim solution to a signal was identified at a cost of approximately \$900,000 per intersection or \$1.8 million for both. The interim solution would be to restripe the intersection to provide two lanes north and southbound and eliminate parking on both sides (currently there is one lane north and southbound with parking on

both sides). The cost of restriping is approximately \$30,000 and would improve the LOS at one intersection to D and LOS C at the other.

Mr. Hauss reviewed Board President Bernheim’s suggested project list that would reprioritize projects 6, 10, 16, 22 and 24. He provided the current level of service for those projects:

Project #	Project	Current LOS	2015 LOS
6	Main Street @ 94 th Avenue W Signal Installation	F	F
10	212 th @ 76 th W Intersection Improvements	D	F
16	Walnut Street @ 9 th Avenue W Intersection Improvement	F	F
22	Caspers @ 9 th Avenue W	C	E
24	84 th Avenue W (212 th Street SW to 238 th Street SW) – will add sidewalks on both sides as well as center left turn lane		

Mr. Hauss explained the possible consequence of not doing a concurrency project is the State may stop development in the vicinity of the project. For example, not doing the 212th @ 76th Avenue W intersection improvement could impact development at Five Corners and potentially Stevens Hospital. Not completing concurrency projects could also impact the City’s ability to obtain grants.

Mr. Hauss explained Board President Bernheim’s suggested list recommends a \$70 license fee in addition to the current \$20 license fee.

Neal Tibbett, Vice Chair, Citizens Transportation Committee, explained he has been involved as a volunteer in the development of the Transportation Plan six years ago as well as the current Transportation Plan. He explained the development of the Transportation Plan included review of traffic studies, level of service designations, as well as different types of transportation such as automobile, bicycle and walking. Several open houses were held to gather citizens input regarding safety concerns and citizens’ vision which was followed by a planning/approval process where the Transportation Committee’s recommendations were submitted to the Planning Board, further revised by the Committee and approved by the Planning Board and forwarded to the City Council for approval.

Mr. Tibbett explained projects are prioritized using the LOS rankings, traffic trends, solicitation of information from other cities, citizens’ input regarding safety concerns around schools and in neighborhoods and potential for grant funding. He noted the City could lower its LOS standards. However, one of the unintended consequences of lowering level of service and increasing wait times at intersections is vehicles are pushed off main arterials into neighborhoods which creates safety concerns on residential streets not intended for those traffic speeds/volumes. He cited the Interurban Trail as an example of a project that was funded via federal, state and local funds.

Mr. Tibbett relayed the Citizens Transportation Committee’s recommendations:

1. Consider no more than a \$40 license fee. This amount would provide the highest potential approval rate. The Committee feels a case can be made to citizens for a \$40 license fee. If progress can be shown on those projects, a higher license fee could be recommended in 2015.
2. Focus on improving LOS particularly concurrency projects that are already at LOS D or F.
3. Look for and complete highly visible projects in the City that demonstrate attentiveness by the Committee and City Council to provide for the safe transit of citizens.

Jeff Daggett, Citizens Transportation Committee, relayed his background in engineering as President and CEO of a large regional firm involved in transportation, aviation and land development projects. He emphasized the importance of a Transportation Plan and Capital Improvement Plan because agencies

such as the Puget Sound Regional Council allocate funding via those plans. He pointed out now was an excellent time to begin projects because construction costs are low due to the down economy. The availability of contractors also allows projects to be completed in a timelier manner.

Fred Gouge, representing the Port of Edmonds on the Citizens Transportation Committee, explained the Committee worked very hard to develop a plan. He stressed the need to keep concurrency projects on the priority list to ensure funding could be obtained for those projects. The Committee recommended a license fee of \$40 because they believe the citizens will support the projects that amount will fund.

Board President Bernheim asked when the Committee recommended a \$40 license fee. Mr. Gouge answered it had been discussed in the past 2-3 meetings. He relayed the Committee's intent to actively support a \$40 license fee. Mr. Hauss answered the list was presented to the Committee in May 2010 as well as last week; both times they recommended a \$40 license fee.

Board Member Fraley-Monillas explained three former members of the Transportation Committee are now on the Board, including herself, and they thoroughly understand the City's transportation issues. She explained in addition to information provided by the consultant, Committee members walked and biked the City to identify issues.

Board Member Fraley-Monillas asked whether staff was recommending a \$40 license fee. Mr. Hauss answered staff was providing the priority list, not a specific amount. Community Services/Economic Development Director Stephen Clifton explained staff is recommending a set of projects tied to each funding level. Board Member Fraley-Monillas observed the Committee's recommendation was a \$40 license fee in addition to the existing \$20 license fee.

Board Member Plunkett asked whether the Committee's three goals were incorporated into the ranking. Mr. Tibbett agreed they were. Board Member Plunkett referred to Mr. Tibbett's comment that the City could lower its LOS standard, asking whether that would impact the City's ability to obtain grants. Mr. Hauss answered with a LOS F, several of the projects would not be identified as concurrency projects and would not impact the City's ability to acquire grants. However, the delay at those intersections would be significantly increased.

Board Member Plunkett observed the level of service at the intersection of 9th & Main was F. He explained there may be times there are 3-5 cars at the intersection, sometimes more or less, however, as a layperson he would not rank that intersection as F. Mr. Hauss explained Jones & Stokes conducted modeling of the entire City which included machine and manual traffic counts during PM peak hours. He agreed the intersection of Main & 9th may not be a LOS F during the entire day, however, during the PM peak of 4:00 – 6:00, the average delay at the intersection was over 55 seconds, a LOS F.

Board Member Plunkett commented the proposed project would improve a 55 second delay during the PM peak at the cost of \$900,000. Mr. Hauss explained the intersection improvements were identified as a 2009 concurrency project in the Transportation Plan. Board Member Plunkett questioned whether improving a 55 second delay was worth a \$900,000 expenditure. Mr. Hauss noted the Transportation Plan also identified a lower cost, interim solution to restripe the lanes on 9th Avenue between Main and Walnut which would improve the LOS. This interim solution would replace projects 6 and 16.

Board Member Fraley-Monillas asked whether the intersection improvements at Main & 9th impacted the LOS at other intersections. Mr. Hauss answered Walnut & 9th and Main & 9th were within ¼ mile of each other and Caspers & 9th is 2015 concurrency project that is also impacted.

Board Member Buckshnis pointed out the cost of the three projects on 9th was approximately \$2.5 million. She preferred to construct sidewalk projects and suggested the projects on 9th be moved to 2015 and projects such as #23 (238th Street SW walkway) and #19 (80th Avenue W / 180th Street SW Walkway) be moved up. The input she has received from citizens is that sidewalks are needed and most people attending the open houses indicated a signal was not needed at 9th & Walnut.

Board Member Buckshnis relayed an announcement at the Snohomish County Tomorrow (SCT) meeting regarding the availability of \$19.8 million from Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) specifically for beautification enhancement projects. Mr. Hauss advised the City was applying for pedestrian/lighting grants for Main Street between 5th and 9th as well as the Hwy. 99 International District expansion. Board Member Buckshnis asked whether staff ever sought a recommendation from SCT for those projects, noting several jurisdictions such as Marysville, Bothell, and Snohomish have made presentations to SCT. Mr. Hauss responded the City planned to obtain letters of support from several organizations within the city because Main Street is not a regional project. Public Works Director Noel Miller explained staff also works with the Snohomish County Infrastructure Coordinating Committee, a group of Snohomish County cities, who coordinate projects for funding via PSRC.

Board Member Buckshnis asked whether the 2009 concurrency projects could be moved to 2015 and moved back up if a grant were received. Mr. Hauss answered the projects could be moved around. Board Member Buckshnis reiterated her preference for sidewalk projects, noting \$2.5 million for signals on 9th Avenue to improve a 55 second delay was inappropriate. Mr. Hauss suggested the Council indicate whether staff should pursue the interim solution identified for the intersections on 9th Avenue.

Board Member Plunkett asked whether the \$2 million roundabout project at Five Corners was predicated on redevelopment of that area. Mr. Hauss answered that cost was a rough estimate prepared a few years ago; the cost estimate includes acquiring a significant amount of right-of-way. He explained the LOS at that intersection is currently an F and that is the reason it is identified as a concurrency project. Board Member Plunkett expressed surprise that that intersection was a LOS F.

Board President Bernheim reminded August 10 is the deadline to submit information to the auditor to place a license fee on the ballot. He anticipated additional TBD Board meetings would be scheduled before that deadline.

Board Member Wilson explained SCT is typically a group attended by Councilmembers. He expressed his appreciation for Board Member Buckshnis' attendance at those meetings, pointing out Edmonds has not participated in that group for a number of years. He has been attending PSRC meetings.

Board Member Wilson inquired about the replacement cycle via the proposed \$500,000/year overlay project. Mr. Hauss answered it was approximately a 37 year cycle; the City's current overlay cycle is approximately 80 years and the industry standard is 20 years. Board Member Wilson asked whether consideration was given to providing \$900,000/year for overlays which would increase the overlay cycle. Mr. Hauss answered \$900,000/year for overlays would significantly delay the other projects. The goal was to fund overlays as well as walkway and concurrency projects.

Board Member Wilson observed the prioritized list provided by staff was a 10 year list; some projects will be completed in less than 10 years. He asked whether a license fee approved by the voters would sunset. Mr. Clifton answered according to TBD legislation, the TBD must cease collecting the additional license fee upon completion of the project list funded with that license fee. The \$20 license fee for street operations previously adopted by the TBD Board expires in 2026.

Board Member Wilson referred to the intent to complete projects to demonstrate a return on investment, and asked whether an \$80 license fee rather than a \$40 license fee was considered to reduce the 10 year period for project completion. Mr. Tibbett responded some projects may receive grant funding and will be completed sooner. The priority of the projects was not based on date of completion. The Committee did discuss increasing the priority of some of the lower cost walkway projects to demonstrate return on investment to citizens.

For Board Member Wilson, Mr. Hauss advised each \$20 license fee increment generates \$500,000/year or \$5 million over 10 years.

Board Member Fraley-Monillas commented the project at Five Corners had nothing to do with development in that area. The problem is the level of service produced by five lanes of traffic at the intersection.

Board Member Fraley-Monillas clarified the Committee is recommending a \$40 license fee. If the voters approved a \$40 license fee, only projects 1 – 9 could be funded. Mr. Hauss agreed, noting additional projects could be funded if grants were obtained for any of the 1 – 9 projects.

Board Member Fraley-Monillas asked whether staff would return to the Board for approval of the projects beyond 9 if the City obtained grant funds. Mr. Hauss answered staff would proceed with projects in the order of priority unless the Board provided additional guidance with regard to reprioritization of projects.

Board Member Buckshnis noted the City of Seattle did a 2009 Street levy. She asked whether staff had considered requesting funds for street and/or walkway projects as part of a levy. Mr. Miller answered that was an approach that could be considered. The TBD license fee is an opportunity to generate funds that are dedicated to transportation. Board Member Buckshnis indicated her support for a \$40 license fee and suggested staff consider whether to include funding for street and/or walkway projects as part of a levy. Mr. Miller advised staff would consider that.

Board President Bernheim recommended Board Members withhold further comments until a future meeting.

4. AUDIENCE COMMENTS

Al Rutledge, Edmonds, suggested organizing separate groups of citizens to educate voters regarding a TBD license fee and with regard to a City levy. He anticipated the voters would support a license fee if they were informed of the improvements in their area.

5. BOARD COMMENTS

Board Member Wilson commented State law prohibits starting a regular or special meeting before the appointed hour but does not prohibit extending beyond the estimated conclusion time.

Board Member Wilson observed a voter-approved \$40 license fee that generates \$1 million/year would provide \$500,000 to street overlay and the remaining \$500,000/year could be used to fund projects on the list. He asked whether funds would then need to be accrued over 4 years to fund projects 2 and 3. Due to the late hour, Board President Bernheim requested staff respond to Board Member Wilson's question in writing.

6. ADJOURN

With no further business, the TBD Board meeting was adjourned at 7:03 p.m.