

EDMONDS CITY COUNCIL APPROVED MINUTES

December 4, 2007

Following a Special Meeting at 6:00 p.m. for an Executive Session regarding a real estate matter and labor negotiations, the Edmonds City Council meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Mayor Haakenson in the Council Chambers, 250 5th Avenue North, Edmonds. The meeting was opened with the flag salute.

ELECTED OFFICIALS PRESENT

Gary Haakenson, Mayor
Peggy Pritchard Olson, Council President
Michael Plunkett, Councilmember
Richard Marin, Councilmember
Mauri Moore, Councilmember
Deanna Dawson, Councilmember
Dave Orvis, Councilmember
Ron Wambolt, Councilmember

ALSO PRESENT

Hilary Scheibert, Student Representative

STAFF PRESENT

Al Compaan, Police Chief
Duane Bowman, Development Services Director
Dan Clements, Administrative Services Director
Noel Miller, Public Works Director
Dave Gebert, City Engineer
Bertrand Hauss, Transportation Engineer
Don Fiene, Assistant City Engineer
Steve Fisher, Recycling Coordinator
Frances Chapin, Cultural Services Manager
Scott Snyder, City Attorney
Sandy Chase, City Clerk
Jana Spellman, Senior Executive Council Asst.
Jeannie Dines, Recorder

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Additions to the
Agenda

Mayor Haakenson requested the following additions to the agenda: a storm update as Item 3a, resolution authorizing the Mayor and Staff to dispense with competitive bidding requirements in order to address storm-related flooding and landslides as Item 3b, and a report from Snohomish County Cities regarding proposed legislative priorities as Item 6b.

COUNCILMEMBER MARIN MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER MOORE, TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS AMENDED. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

2. CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

COUNCILMEMBER MOORE MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER MARIN, TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. The agenda items approved are as follows:

Roll Call

A. ROLL CALL

Approve
11/20/07
Minutes

B. APPROVAL OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 20, 2007.

Approve
11/27/07
Minutes

C. APPROVAL OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 27, 2007.

Approve Claim
Checks

D. APPROVAL OF CLAIM CHECKS #100405 THROUGH #100591 FOR NOVEMBER 21, 2007 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$551,767.41, AND #100592 THROUGH #100755 FOR NOVEMBER 29, 2007 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$701,589.09.

Recycling Grant Agreement

E. AUTHORIZATION FOR THE MAYOR TO SIGN THE RECYCLING GRANT AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF EDMONDS AND THE WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY FOR 2008-2009.

Sr. Ex. Council Assistant Contract

F. AUTHORIZATION FOR THE MAYOR TO SIGN EMPLOYMENT CONTRACT FOR SR. EX. COUNCIL ASSISTANT JANA SPELLMAN.

4th Avenue Cultural Corridor

G. AUTHORIZATION TO ADVERTISE FOR STATEMENTS OF QUALIFICATION FROM CONSULTING ENGINEERING AND ARCHITECTURAL FIRMS/CONSULTANT TEAMS TO PREPARE DESIGN, COST ESTIMATES, IMPLEMENTATION AND FUNDING PLANS FOR THE 4TH AVENUE CULTURAL CORRIDOR.

164th St. SW Walkway / 74th Pl. Drainage

H. REPORT ON FINAL CONSTRUCTION COSTS FOR THE 164TH STREET SW WALKWAY/74TH PLACE DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT AND COUNCIL ACCEPTANCE OF PROJECT.

Old Woodway Elementary School Demolition

I. REPORT ON FINAL CONSTRUCTION COSTS FOR THE OLD WOODWAY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DEMOLITION PROJECT AND COUNCIL ACCEPTANCE OF PROJECT.

2005 Waterline Replacement Project

J. REPORT ON FINAL CONSTRUCTION COSTS FOR THE 2005 WATERLINE REPLACEMENT PROJECT AND COUNCIL ACCEPTANCE OF PROJECT.

Friar Tuck Lane Drainage Improvements

K. REPORT ON FINAL CONSTRUCTION COSTS FOR THE FRIAR TUCK LANE DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT AND COUNCIL ACCEPTANCE OF PROJECT.

December 2 – 3 Storm Update

3A. STORM UPDATE

Mayor Haakenson provided an update on the rain and wind event that occurred over the last two days. He declared a State of Emergency for the City of Edmonds yesterday afternoon which allows the City to apply for federal funds for damage to public property. He noted the gauges at the treatment plant showed over 5 inches of rain in 36 hours, an enormous amount of rain in a short period of time particularly following the weekend snowfall. All the creeks and streams in Edmonds drain into Puget Sound as do the storm drains. During the peak of the heavy rains, it was also a high tide and consequently there was nowhere for the stormwater to go and it backed up, flooding homes, streets and any low-lying areas. The volume of water also soaked into hillsides, causing many landslides. The Public Works and Parks crews were very busy and did an excellent job responding to incidents. He has received several telephone calls and emails thanking City crews for their response.

Mayor Haakenson advised there were several areas that will require immediate, emergency work including Olympic View Drive & 76th Avenue West. He noted in some areas where slides occurred, no action could be taken until the rains ceased. He stated private property owners who sustained property damage from the December 2-3 event may also be eligible for federal funds and should report their information to the Emergency Services Coordinating Agency (ESCA) at 425-776-3722. He noted this information would also be posted on the City’s website and on Channel 21.

Mayor Haakenson advised the Council would be asked tonight to approve a motion that would allow City staff to waive any development fees such as permit fees and plan review fees for property owners to repair damage from the storm event. The City will also expedite permit review on those projects.

Waive Development Fees / Storm Event

COUNCILMEMBER MARIN MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER WAMBOLT, TO WAIVE DEVELOPMENT FEES FOR PROPERTY OWNERS FOR WORK RELATED TO REPAIRING DAMAGE CAUSED BY THE STORM EVENT. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

3B. RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND STAFF TO DISPENSE WITH COMPETITIVE BIDDING REQUIREMENTS IN ORDER TO ADDRESS STORM-RELATED FLOODING AND LANDSLIDES.

Public Works Director Noel Miller reported yesterday the City was hit by a severe Pacific Ocean weather system that dropped over 5 inches of rain on the City. The event overburdened stormwater facilities on Olympic View Drive & 76th Avenue West. He displayed photographs of the following conditions:

- Water coming out of catch basins and manholes.
- Water running down the streets and off private property.
- A worker clearing debris from a submerged culvert in a ravine.
- Slide debris on 190th uphill from Olympic View Drive where an embankment gave way.
- An overcapacity culvert on Perrinville Creek as it enters Puget Sound downstream of Olympic View Drive.
- Slide debris on North Meadowdale Road.
- A storm surge from Lynnwood's trunk line on 76th Avenue north of Perrinville post office that City crews sandbagged to prevent water from entering private property.

He further displayed a photograph of a sinkhole created by the flooding, noting the repairs would be significant due to the steep embankment into Perrinville Creek. He estimated the repair to be \$300,000, advising further information would be provided to the Council as costs became available. He displayed a photograph of the washout on Olympic View Drive where half of the road was undermined, requiring closure of Olympic View Drive. He noted the City was aware of a potential washout issue in this area and the Engineering Division had already prepared a design. The contractor has indicated they can mobilize and begin work on this repair next week.

Mr. Miller advised a substantial reimbursement for these repairs would be available via the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and Federal Highway Administration (FHA). He recommended the Council adopt the resolution authorizing the Mayor and Staff to dispense with competitive bidding requirements in order to address storm-related flooding and landslides and to appropriate up to one million dollars from the Street and Combined Utility Capital Funds.

City Attorney Scott Snyder explained the City would continue to use standard contracting forms, bonding would be required, etc.; the Council would only be dispensing with the formal bidding process, the process of obtaining prevailing wage, etc. The State statute establishing those requirements recognizes those procedures can take 45-90 days to complete and are not appropriate in an emergency. The purpose of the resolution is for the Council to find there is an emergency and to waive those procedures. He pointed out the resolution includes a provision for the Staff and Mayor to report to the Council in January 2008 on the extent and cost for ratification of contracts and consultants.

Councilmember Plunkett asked if one million dollars was a cap on the expenditure. Mr. Miller answered yes. Councilmember Plunkett clarified the Council was authorizing dispensing with the competitive bidding process up to one million dollars. Mr. Snyder answered by State law the Mayor had the ability to move funds within the General Fund and Utility Funds, however, could not move funds from the Combined Utility Fund to the General Fund. Most of expenditures would come from the Stormwater Drainage Fund or other portions of the Utility Fund. A second control exists via amendments to the biennial budget and any actual costs would be reflected in the annual amendments.

Councilmember Plunkett asked how this would impact the budget long term. Mr. Miller answered how the budget was impacted would be determined by the amount of reimbursement the City received from FEMA and FHA. Mr. Snyder commented the Council periodically reviewed its utility rates and this would be an issue to be considered.

Councilmember Orvis asked how long the criteria would be waived and how staff would prevent it being applied to scheduled projects. Mr. Snyder answered it was limited to emergency expenditures related to this storm event.

Res# 1156 -
Dispense with
Competitive
Bidding to
Address Storm
Flooding &
Landslides

COUNCILMEMBER MARIN MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER ORVIS, TO ADOPT RESOLUTION NO. 1156, AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND STAFF TO DISPENSE WITH COMPETITIVE BIDDING REQUIREMENTS IN ORDER TO ADDRESS STORM-RELATED FLOODING AND LANDSLIDES AND TO APPROPRIATE UP TO ONE MILLION DOLLARS FROM THE STREET AND COMBINED UTILITY CAPITAL FUNDS. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Water Use
Efficiency
Rules; Water
Saving
Programs

3C. PUBLIC HEARING ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON WATER USE EFFICIENCY RULES BY ESTABLISHING WATER SAVING PROGRAMS AND GOALS.

Public Works Director Noel Miller remarked the annual rainfall that occurs over the geographic area of the City only amounted to half of the water Edmonds consumes in a year. He explained HB 1338, known as the Municipal Water Law became effective January 22, 2007. This directs the Department of Health (DOH) to adopt enforceable water use efficiency (WUE) programs for water suppliers.

He reviewed elements of the WUE:

- Planning - as part of a water system plan, water suppliers must:
 - Collect production and consumption data.
 - Forecast future water demand.
 - Evaluate WUE measures.
 - Calculate distribution system leakage.
 - Implement WUE program to meet goals.
- Leakage - water suppliers must meet distribution system leakage standard of 10% or less by 2010.
 - Due to the City's annual leak monitoring and main replacement program, the City currently meets this standard.
- Goals - water suppliers must set WUE goals and track their performance.
 - Goals must be set through a public process by January 22, 2008.
 - Must report annual performance to customers and DOH beginning July 1, 2008.

He reviewed WUE mandatory goals, advising Edmonds was currently in compliance with these goals:

- Source meter installation.
- Consumption meters installation.
- Meter calibration.
- Water loss control action plan.
- Customer education.

He reviewed additional WUE goals to evaluate:

- Rates that encourage water demand efficiency - the City currently utilizes a uniform rate (same cost per unit of water for the amount of water consumed). Rate structures that would encourage more water efficiency include seasonal rates (higher rates in the summer) and inclining block rate (higher unit costs for larger water users).
- Use of reclaimed water - due to the location of the City's treatment plant in a lowland area, reuse would require additional treatment as well as separate pipes for disbursement; therefore, it was not effective to reuse reclaimed water. He noted there were other methods such as a vehicle washing station which is included in this year's budget. He advised other methods would be evaluated during the next update of the Water Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Miller explained prior to adoption of the Municipal Water Law, the City was involved in a regional WUE program with the City of Everett. Everett implemented a 6-year regional water conservation program in 2001 with a purveyors advisory group as part of Everett's 2001 Water System Plan. In developing water use efficiencies to comply with WUE, the water purveyor advisory group evaluated over 30 conservation measures (the rule requires at least 12 be evaluated). The group examined some of the previous measures as well as many new ones. For each measure, savings potential and cost per CCF (100 cubic feet) was determined.

The group used selection criteria with the objective of demonstrating sound stewardship of regional water resources and to meet the intent of the WUE Rule. The program needed to be cost effective in the range of avoided cost. The cost avoided or deferred by conservation was 35 cents per CCF.

He reviewed Everett's updated regional program to comply with the Rule.

- New program has 8 primary measures.
- Designed to save 1.97 MGD through 2012 at a cost of \$3.6 million or 47 cents per CCF.
- The costs are higher and savings less than the previous program because the least costly measures have been exhausted.

Everett's regional measures include a large school education component (required by the Rule); continues the indoor/outdoor kits and school irrigation audits, adds leak detection, toilet and clothes washer rebates for single family, multi-family and commercial customers; adds indoor water audits for businesses. He introduced Recycling Coordinator Steve Fisher who provided outdoor and indoor kits for the Council and the public. Additional Edmonds WUE goals include continuing annual water main replacement program and completing the City building plumbing fixture retrofits. The kits and regional water use efficiency measures equated to 2.5 cents per CCF or approximately 1% of the average water bill.

Mr. Miller reviewed a chart illustrating water purchased from the City of Seattle, Alderwood Water District and the total annual water consumption for 1988 through 2006, noting the trend was a ½ percent savings per year. The City's WUE program exhibits sound stewardship of the water resources and goes well beyond what was required by the Rule and builds on past success. The City will work with Everett annually to evaluate the effectiveness of the program. He described required action by the Council: the Council must take public comment, then approve the Water savings goal and formally adopt it as the City's WUE goal. He advised the goal was to continue to reduce annual water consumption by a minimum of 1% on a per capita basis and participate in Everett's Regional Water Efficiency Program.

Councilmember Plunkett referred to the water usage chart, inquiring about the difference in the amount of water purchased from Alderwood Water versus Seattle Water. Mayor Haakenson answered the City purchased from whoever provided the least expensive water. Mr. Miller explained Seattle raised their prices significantly in 1999 and the City determined it would be more cost effective to buy water year-round from Alderwood.

Councilmember Orvis clarified the Council was not approving any rate changes tonight. Mr. Miller agreed, explaining the Council needed to approve the water savings goal and compliance with the Rule via establishing formal WUE requirements.

Councilmember Wambolt referred to an article in today's *Wall Street Journal* regarding municipalities restricting use of water for vehicle washing; Seattle was mentioned in the article as one of the leaders in that effort. He noted some municipalities even ban fundraising car washes. He asked whether the City was considering similar measures. Mr. Miller answered yes, noting it is driven more by stormwater runoff requirements such as not getting soap into the stormwater system rather than the WUE Rule.

Mayor Haakenson opened the public participation portion of the public hearing.

Al Rutledge, Edmonds, commended Mr. Miller for the information he provided. He commented on the amount of water the City purchased from Alderwood Water versus Seattle Water, concluding the City had done an excellent job addressing the water situation.

Hearing no further public comment, Mayor Haakenson closed the public comment portion of the public hearing.

COUNCILMEMBER PLUNKETT MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER MARIN, TO ADOPT THE WATER EFFICIENCY MEASURES THAT THE CITY WILL USE TO IMPLEMENT FOR THE EFFICIENT USE OF THE REGIONAL WATER RESOURCES.

As different rate structures were considered, Councilmember Orvis cautioned the City not to inadvertently develop a rate structure that was difficult on large families who may be conserving water but used more water due to the number of family members.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

196th St. SW /
88th Ave. W
Intersection
Engineering
Study

4. PUBLIC HEARING ON THE 196TH STREET SW/88TH AVENUE WEST INTERSECTION ENGINEERING STUDY.

Transportation Engineer Bertrand Hauss explained in March 2007 the Council approved \$20,000 to begin a study of the 196th Street SW/88th Avenue West intersection and Gray & Osborne was selected to prepare the engineering study. In November 2007 the City and Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) recommended improvements and their recommendation was approved by the Community Services/Development Services Committee and forwarded to the City Council for a public hearing.

Tamara Nack, Gray & Osborne, explained the purpose of the study was to evaluate operational and design deficiencies of the 196th Street SW/88th Avenue West intersection as well as evaluate alternates. She displayed a vicinity map, identifying 196th Street SW (also known as Puget Drive and SR 524), 88th Avenue West and the dead-end portion of 196th Street. She pointed out an important component in the evaluation was 196th Street SW was a principal arterial and State Route which required that WSDOT approve any improvements. She identified 88th Avenue W as a collector and the dead-end portion of 196th Street as a local access street.

Ms. Nack identified speed limits on 196th Street SW and results of their speed study:

East of 88 th Avenue West		West of 88 th Avenue West	
Average	85 th Percentile	Average	85 th Percentile
32 mph	36 mph	34 mph	39 mph

Next she reviewed the accident history for the intersection for the past three years (2004-2006), explaining there had been eight accidents at the intersection attributable to the design of the intersection - one in 2004, three in 2005 and four in 2006. She advised there were three accidents from the north leg, one accident from a vehicle turning left onto 88th; the other four accidents occurred on the south leg, two rear-end accidents and two collision accidents.

Next she reviewed traffic counts, summarizing there were approximately 13,000 vehicles per day on 196th Street SW, 1300 vehicles per day on the south leg of 88th Avenue W, and 400 vehicles on the north leg of 88th Avenue West. She summarized the majority of movement was on 196th. She identified peak hour volumes (7:30 to 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 to 5:00 p.m.), 1,000 vehicles on 196th, 120 on the north leg of 88th and 60 on the south leg of 88th.

Ms. Nack explained in order to evaluate intersections, the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) was used for geometric design and the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) was used to determine whether a signal or stop signs were warranted. She displayed a map of the intersection and reviewed existing curvature and sight distance.

She reviewed the intersection's geometric design deficiencies:

	Existing	AASHTO
Horizontal Curve	360'	485'
Intersection Sight Distance		
South Leg		
Left Turn	280'	470'
Right Turn	400'	382'
North Leg		
Left Turn	455'	470'
Right Turn	535'	382'

Ms. Nack explained the City had adopted a level of service (LOS) D. She reviewed average delay per vehicle for a stop control intersection, advising the existing LOS at the intersection was between C and D; installation of a 4-way stop would reduce the LOS to F. She reviewed the average delay per vehicle for a signalized intersection. She compared the LOS for a signal at this intersection to the existing LOS:

Road	A.M.		P.M.	
	Signal	Existing	Signal	Existing
Intersection	C	C	C	C
196 th Street SW (westbound)	C	A	C	A
Puget Drive (northeast bound)	C	A	C	A
88 th Avenue West (southbound)	C	D	B	D
88 th Avenue West (northbound)	B	B	C	C

She displayed a list of 11 signal warrants in the MUTCD, summarizing at a minimum an intersection would need to meet one of the criteria to warrant a signal; the volumes on 88th Avenue West were not high enough to meet the volume criteria:

- Warrant 1: Minimum Vehicular Volume
- Warrant 2: Interruption of Continuous Traffic
- Warrant 3: Minimum Pedestrian Volume (100 pedestrians/hour)
- Warrant 4: School Crossings
- Warrant 5: Progressive Movement
- Warrant 6: Accident Experience (at least 5 accidents/year)
- Warrant 7: Systems
- Warrant 8: Combination of Warrants
- Warrant 9: Four-Hour Volumes
- Warrant 10: Peak Hour Delay
- Warrant 11: Peak Hour Volume

She reviewed the alternatives:

- *Alternative A: No Improvement*
- *Alternative B: Limit Access on the north and south legs* - left turn movements for traffic southbound on 88th would be restricted, allowing straight through movement or right turn. She displayed a map identifying out-of-direction travel in the neighborhood, estimating that approximately 1,000 vehicles per day would be rerouted through the neighborhood.

- *Alternative C: Four Way Stop Control (\$1,000)* - warrants are not met, LOS drops to F and results in increased noise and air pollution due to stopping vehicles.
- *Alternative D: Traffic Signal (\$344,000)* - warrants are not met, LOS C, results in increased noise and air pollution due to stopping vehicles, and increased rear-end accidents due to stops on 196th Street SW.
- *Alternative E: Intersection Realignment (\$2,369,000)* - high cost attributable to retaining walls due to the slope, drainage issues, and acquiring right-of-way.
- *Alternative F: Roundabout (\$3,966,000)* - high cost due to reducing the current 8% grade to the required 4% grade.
- *Alternative G: Limit Access eastbound (\$15,000)* - vehicles traveling north on 88th could turn right only; left turns and straight through travel would not be permitted. There would be no change in the movement of traffic traveling southbound on 88th.

Ms. Nack explained staff met with WSDOT to review the study and alternatives; WSDOT will not support alternative C or D because the intersection did not meet the warrants in the MUTCD. WSDOT also did not support alternatives E or F primarily due to the cost. She reviewed the recommendation, Alternative G, explaining WSDOT supports this alternative, the cost is approximately \$15,000, the improvement addresses the sight distance issue on the south leg, and there is no impact on Community Transit or Edmonds School District bus routing.

Councilmember Orvis asked whether accident data for 2007 was available. Ms. Nack answered no. Councilmember Orvis commented there were six accidents listed for 2006 and questioned why two were excluded. Ms. Nack answered one was a single vehicle accident that was not attributable to sight distance at the intersection and the other accident was a rear-end westbound on 196th due to vehicle stopping for a bicycle. Councilmember Orvis asked whether excess speed due to the absence of a signal could have caused the first accident. Ms. Nack answered she did not believe so.

Councilmember Orvis referred to Warrant 7 which relates to trends in volume, noting the study identified that as unknown for the signal and asked whether that could be established with further study. Ms. Nack answered there was a very low probability it would meet the warrant. Councilmember Orvis asked if realignment of the intersection would allow it to meet the warrant for a stop sign. She responded the challenge with installing a 4-way stop at the intersection was it would drop the LOS to F and based on her discussions with WSDOT, they would not support stop signs.

Councilmember Wambolt questioned whether the sight distance could be improved if the speeds of traffic from Puget Drive were reduced. Ms. Nack agreed there was a correlation between speed and sight distance; the lower the speed limit the less sight distance was required. Councilmember Wambolt commented the speed limit downhill on Puget Drive was 30 mph. Ms. Nack agreed, noting uphill it was 35 mph. She noted a speed study would be required to change the speed limit. Councilmember Wambolt commented the speed limit may not need to be changed, only enforced. He suggested installing speed monitors such as were installed on 220th Street that display a driver's speed which may cause drivers to slow down. Ms. Nack commented their study showed the current average speed was 32-34 mph and the 85th percentile was 34-39 mph which means the majority of drivers were traveling the speed limit. Councilmember Wambolt commented drivers traveling the speed limit was not his experience when traveling in that area.

Councilmember Plunkett asked whether ferry traffic at the Edmonds terminal was increasing. City Engineer Dave Gebert agreed increases in ferry traffic were projected. Mayor Haakenson commented the City was working with WSDOT and Lynnwood to direct all ferry traffic southbound on Hwy. 99 to SR 104 to keep traffic off 196th.

(Councilmember Moore left the meeting at 8:03 p.m.)

Councilmember Plunkett asked what the State would say if the City asked for a signal at that intersection. Based on his experience with WSDOT, Mr. Gebert anticipated WSDOT would say no. Ms. Nack explained staff met with WSDOT and they said no to a signal because it did not meet the warrants. If the City wanted a signal at this intersection, she recommended continuing to monitor volumes and accidents at the intersection and once they met the warrants, advocate for a signal.

Councilmember Orvis asked whether WSDOT's negative response was based on warrants and not LOS. She stated it was based on the warrants. She reiterated the volume of traffic on 88th was too low to warrant a signal at this point.

Councilmember Orvis asked about the warrants at other intersections on 196th. Ms. Nack answered she only considered this intersection. Mr. Hauss advised the records for the 196th Street SW/80th Avenue West intersection indicated it met the warrants; in 1980 there were a total of four right-angle accidents between westbound and southbound traffic. The City obtained a grant for that intersection and the signal was approved by WSDOT.

Councilmember Dawson commented one of the difficulties with this intersection in addition to sight distances was the need to watch traffic coming from different directions. She noted many people did not use this intersection because of the dangers and perhaps that was the reason it did not meet the volume warrant. She asked whether there was any way to measure vehicles that rerouted through the neighborhood to avoid this intersection. Ms. Nack advised Gray & Osborne and City staff discussed the theory that drivers avoided the intersection but had not been able to develop a way to prove it.

Councilmember Dawson asked whether "almost-accidents" could be considered, pointing out the danger of turning left onto 88th Avenue West from 196th. Ms. Nack advised there was only one accident documented for a vehicle turning left; emphasizing the importance of drivers reporting accidents. She was not aware of using near-miss incidents to meet a warrant. Councilmember Dawson asked if staff knew of a way to document the amount of traffic that rerouted through the neighborhood to avoid the intersection. Mr. Gebert advised staff was beginning the update to the Transportation Comprehensive Plan. During the last update, traffic counts and turning movements were considered for strategic intersections. It may be possible to take traffic counts in that vicinity to evaluate the amount of rerouting that is occurring.

Mayor Haakenson opened the public participation portion of the public hearing.

Chris Kelly, Edmonds, thanked the Council for studying the intersection but was surprised the study focused only on vehicular traffic and not on pedestrian traffic. He pointed out the difficulty students have crossing the street to reach the park and to reach the Community Transit bus stop to Edmonds-Woodway High School and the park. He noted the nearest marked crosswalk was ½ mile in either direction. He requested the city consider striping and signing a crosswalk in addition to perhaps a stop sign. He questioned the consultant's indication that the speed limit at the intersection was 35 mph, pointing out it was signed 35 mph westbound beyond the intersection and 35 mph eastbound beyond the intersection, therefore, the uphill speed limit was 30 mph. He questioned whether traffic traveling 39 mph in a 30 mph zone would affect the study and/or warrants.

Rick Behern, Edmonds, described the alternate route many neighborhood residents use to cross 196th. He expressed concern that vehicles traveling north on 88th that were unable to turn left would use Maplewood Lane instead to turn left onto 196th. Next he described the situation that occurs with vehicles southbound on 88th Avenue West who enter the intersection and become trapped in the center of the intersection by oncoming traffic.

Joel Valley, Edmonds, commented on new development that has occurred north of 196th. He expressed concern with the crosswalk across 88th Avenue West on the north side, noting he drives his daughter to/from school because of the dangers of using that crosswalk. He noted the speed of vehicles traveling westbound on 196th and vegetation obstruct the sight distance of the crosswalk. Another problem was only about half the drivers stopped at the stop sign at 88th and 196th. Another issue was how to signal when traveling westbound on 196th to indicate an intent to continue straight on 196th.

John Pierre, Edmonds, commented in the study, Alternative G showed a no left turn sign for vehicles traveling southbound on the north leg of 88th.

Mayor Haakenson explained that was not the recommendation by staff or the Community Services/Development Services Committee; the only change recommended was the right turn only northbound on 88th.

Mr. Pierre commented there had been six accidents at that intersection in 2007, one more would allow the intersection to meet the warrants. He pointed out this was the most dangerous intersection in the City; the major hazard was to northbound traffic approaching 196th from the south leg of 88th. The right turn onto 196th is hazardous due to the blind spot looking down Puget Drive. Few drivers attempt to cross to the north leg of 88th or turn left to go down “snake hill” into Edmonds due to danger. Another danger is traffic westbound on 196th attempting to turn left onto 88th due to the dark, tree covered chasm down Puget Drive which can be further complicated by afternoon sun in a driver’s eyes. He summarized the recommended alternative would accomplish little if anything because most of the traffic northbound on the south leg of 88th already turned right onto 196th. He commented there was little interruption in flow of traffic of the northbound traffic at the 196th Street SW/80th Avenue West intersection because the approaching traffic from 80th activated the signal. He noted the 196th Street SW/88th Avenue West intersection had similar traffic patterns with the major difference that the intersection at 196th Street SW/80th Avenue West had no sight distance issues.

Karen Lingman, Edmonds, supported Alternative G as the best solution to the problem. She disagreed that drivers did not cross 88th Avenue West or that drivers did not turn left onto 196th, commenting she witnessed those traffic movements daily. She also disagreed that traffic rerouted through the neighborhood to enter 196th. She was opposed to a signal at the intersection.

Robert Schwartz, Edmonds, commented on vehicles speeding across 196th on 88th to avoid oncoming cars. He explained he often turned right at the 196th Street SW/88th Avenue West and turned around in the church parking lot to travel westbound on Puget Drive. When walking, his family walks east on 196th to a point where the sight distance is sufficient to cross safely.

Roger Hertrich, Edmonds, commented on the conflicts that vehicles westbound on 196th turning left onto 88th experience with oncoming traffic on Puget Drive and traffic on the south leg of 88th. He suggested creating a pocket for those slowing vehicles, envisioning there was sufficient right-of-way for that improvement. He referred to the cost of realigning the intersection, suggesting incremental improvements be made such as increasing the turning radius for drivers turning right off 88th onto 196th or improving the sight distance down Puget Drive for drivers turning left from 88th onto 196th. He did not support a signal at this intersection due to the difficulty for vehicles eastbound on Puget Drive to start uphill as well as the noise it would create. He recalled the light at 196th Street SW/80th Avenue West was installed while he was on the Council. Due to concerns with interrupting the flow of traffic on 196th, the right turn pocket was widened so that right turns did not activate at the light.

Al Rutledge, Edmonds, commented the solution was either widening 196th to two lanes in each direction or making 196th a one-way street. He referred to residents’ desire for a signal at SR 104 and 1st NE, advising it required a sixth accident for that intersection to meet the warrants for a signal.

Rick Colgan, Edmonds, pointed out his concern was pedestrians attempting to cross this intersection and the virtual impossibility to cross from the north side of 196th to the south side to reach the park. He and his friends referred to this intersection as “the intersection of death.” He suggested the design include a north-south pedestrian access or an island that pedestrians could seek refuge on. He concluded whatever design was selected, it needed to improve access for pedestrians.

D.J. Wilson, Edmonds, encouraged Council to continue to monitor the intersection if they adopted the recommendation. He agreed with Mr. Hertrich’s suggestion for incremental improvements such as a 3-5 year phased approach to realignment. He suggested if this intersection was deemed by Council to be an emergency, removing the competitive bidding requirements would be appropriate.

Hearing no further public comment, Mayor Haakenson closed the public comment portion of the public hearing.

Ms. Nack acknowledged stated the bottom line was the intersection did not meet the warrants for a signal at this time. With regard to pedestrian volumes to warrant a signal, she advised the warrant required 100 pedestrians an hour. With regard to taking a right turn when westbound on 196th, she acknowledged that was a difficult turn. Consideration was given to a triangular island to define that turn and to provide refuge for pedestrians crossing 196th. She advised this was not discussed in detail with WSDOT. With regard to the concern with the amount of traffic that would be rerouted via Alternative G, she advised approximately 30% of vehicles northbound on 88th turn left west or go straight; 70% turn right.

Mayor Haakenson commented on citizens’ frustration when they call requesting a crosswalk or stop sign in their neighborhood and are told that there are rules (warrants) that must be followed. He asked the outcome if the City installed a crosswalk regardless of the warrants. Ms. Nack recommended the City contact their liability insurance company. She noted cities had installed crosswalks in locations that were not warranted that were later removed. She referred to cities in Pierce County that installed flashing crosswalks and later removed them due to accidents occurring in those crosswalks because of the false sense of security they provided to pedestrians. She remarked traffic engineering was not an exact science but was based on experience. Before the City installed signals, crosswalks or stop signs that did not meet the warrants, she recommended the City talk with WCIA regarding the risks. Mr. Snyder explained the City would become the virtual insurer for any accident that occurred regardless of who was liable or why the accident occurred.

Mayor Haakenson asked who created the warrants and who required cities follow the warrants. Ms. Nack advised it was a national standard established by the Institute of Transportation Engineers adopted nationwide as well as in the RCWs. Mr. Snyder commented installing traffic controls that were not warranted was one of the surest ways to lose the City’s insurance pool membership.

Councilmember Plunkett asked if the City would be liable if the State installed the signal. Mr. Snyder answered no, commenting because this was a State route, the State’s permission was required.

Councilmember Dawson referred to a comment by the public that there had been six accidents in 2007. Ms. Nack answered she had no knowledge of the number of accidents in 2007. She advised there were six accidents in 2006 but only four could be attributed to sight distance. Councilmember Dawson asked whether six or more accidents in 2007 would change the discussion with WSDOT. Ms. Nack responded the accident reports would need to be reviewed to determine the cause of the accidents and if they were attributable to sight distance, it could change the discussion with WSDOT. She recalled as of June/July 2007 there had been only one accident at the intersection.

Councilmember Dawson recommended staff report to the Council on the number of accidents at this intersection in 2007 and 2008 for further consideration of whether it met the warrants.

With regard to a crosswalk, Mr. Hauss explained in addition to the warrants, another consideration for a crosswalk was a minimum sight distance. Because this is not a 4-legged intersection with good visibility and due to the curvature of the roads, the 35 mph speed required a minimum sight distance of approximately 300 feet and there was only 280 feet of sight distance at the intersection. He explained the reason staff and the consultant did not recommend limiting movements on the north side was the ratio between volume and accidents found it was 4-5 times more dangerous to make a left turn from the south leg than the north leg of 88th.

Councilmember Dawson inquired about the City's liability if the Council did not adopt the recommendation to limit left turns and straight travel on the south leg of 88th. Mr. Snyder answered the question would be whether the warrants were sufficient to continue that turning motion. Mr. Gebert noted although the objective was to identify an alternative that improved the safety of the intersection, staff's second choice was no action. Because the objective of the study was to improve safety, staff and the consultant's recommendation was Alternative G. He noted the accident rates were not high, possibly because drivers used different routes.

Councilmember Dawson asked for further information regarding routes that drivers would use if unable to turn left from 88th on 196th or go straight through. She questioned whether residents of neighborhoods where drivers may be rerouted had been notified of the public hearing so that they could comment on the additional traffic their neighborhood may experienced. Ms. Nack commented routes drivers would take would vary depending on driver behavior.

Councilmember Dawson inquired about the notice provided. City Clerk Sandy Chase answered the mailing was to property owners within 300 feet of the location. Councilmember Dawson asked whether the intersection of the other outlet, Maplewood Lane, was included in that mailing. Mr. Gebert answered probably not. Councilmember Dawson observed a significant number of vehicles would be using Maplewood Lane.

Councilmember Orvis commented 88th Avenue West was a collector; therefore, its role was to funnel traffic in and out of the neighborhood. He referred to the consultant's finding of unknown with regard to Warrant 7, Systems. The definition of Warrant 7 is this warrant justifies the installation of a traffic signal to encourage concentration and organization of traffic flow on a roadway network. He asked whether Warrant 7 would apply if large numbers of people were not using the collector due to concerns with the intersection's safety. Ms. Nack answered when they met with WSDOT, she pushed for this warrant and WSDOT was not interested. She commented this warrant could continue to be pursued; consideration would also need to be given to five year projected traffic volumes. Before pursuing that warrant further, she recommended the City discuss with WSDOT their willingness to explore that warrant.

COUNCILMEMBER MARIN MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCIL PRESIDENT OLSON, TO ADOPT OPTION G.

Councilmember Marin commented the five streets created dimensional challenges at this intersection and he acknowledged there were no easy answers. He noted this intersection was different than 80th, where he lives. He relayed his experience with a traffic light malfunction at the intersection of 196th and 80th during yesterday's storm, noting this was the situation before the traffic signal was installed and he anticipated having to "make a mad dash" across the street. He commented vehicles were not traveling 30 mph in either direction on 196th. He noted the recommended improvement at the intersection required a relatively small expenditure and would allow the improvement to be done quickly. He agreed it was challenging for pedestrians crossing 196th and asked staff to consider signage discouraging pedestrians

from crossing the intersection and directing them to another crossing. He supported Alternative G because he wanted some improvement to be made to the intersection.

Council President Olson commented the primary reason for the study was to identify an alternative to make the intersection safer and staff, the consultant and WSDOT agreed the recommended alternative would accomplish that goal. She noted the City would continue to monitor the intersection and if the intersection met the warrants in the future, a traffic signal could be pursued. She did not support doing nothing in the meantime.

Councilmember Orvis expressed concern with creating a dangerous situation elsewhere by pushing the problem onto other streets in the neighborhood such as Maplewood Lane. Because 88th was a collector, the City's plans called for 88th to direct traffic to that intersection, therefore, the City should be encouraging its use. He acknowledged there were major safety issues at the intersection, but the safety solution was a traffic signal. He acknowledged the intersection did not meet the warrants and he did not want to meet Warrant 6, Accident Experience (at least 5 accidents/year). He preferred to convince WSDOT and the State legislature that the intersection met Warrant 7 as a traffic signal would be the safest solution.

Councilmember Dawson was also concerned with pushing the problem elsewhere. She anticipated drivers would turn left or right from the intersection of 196th Street SW & 84th Avenue West which was also not a very safe intersection, rather than traveling to the signal at 80th Avenue West. She requested further information about the intersection of 196th Street SW & 84th Avenue West to determine whether that would be a safe situation. She agreed the City should continue to monitor the intersection, agreeing without a signal the intersection was not safe for pedestrians. She was uncertain whether Alternative G would improve the safety of the intersection. She agreed with Councilmember Orvis' comment about 88th Avenue being a collector.

Councilmember Wambolt acknowledged some citizens did not find value in Alternative G. This may be a situation where the Council needed to tell staff and the consultant they wanted a traffic light and have them figure out how to achieve it.

Mayor Haakenson pointed out the consultant and staff tried that. He referred to Councilmember Orvis' comment that the City should talk to the State legislature and challenged Councilmembers to work with the legislature.

Councilmember Wambolt accepted Mayor Haakenson's challenge, commenting the difficulty for pedestrians had been downplayed. He concluded the only solution was a traffic signal and the City needed to find a way to get one.

Mayor Haakenson pointed out a similar situation on SR 104 at 238th where residents have begged the State for a traffic signal. He noted drivers had been killed at that intersection and WSDOT still refused to install a signal.

UPON ROLL CALL, MOTION FAILED (2-4), COUNCIL PRESIDENT OLSON AND COUNCILMEMBER MARIN IN FAVOR AND COUNCILMEMBERS ORVIS, DAWSON, WAMBOLT, AND PLUNKETT OPPOSED. (Councilmember Moore was not present for the vote.)

Councilmember Orvis suggested a resolution to the legislature.

Councilmember Plunkett commented any solution other than a traffic signal was only a bandaid and would simply push the problem to another street. He thanked the consultant for the excellent study and presentation and staff for their work. He was hopeful, perhaps via legislative action or additional

evaluation, that a signal could be installed. Mayor Haakenson suggested Councilmember Orvis and Plunkett work on a resolution for Council consideration at the next Council meeting.

Snohomish
County Cities
Proposed
Legislative
Priorities

6B. REPORT FROM SNOHOMISH COUNTY CITIES REGARDING PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES.

Mukilteo Council President Jennifer Gregerson explained she along with Mukilteo Councilmember Liias, Mayor Haakenson and Council President Olson serve on the Legislative Committee for Snohomish County Cities. She recalled a presentation was made to the Council on legislative priorities last year; the Legislative Committee lobbied the legislature with regard to those issues. She recalled last year's priorities included flexibility with REET funds for park maintenance in addition to park acquisition, auto theft reform and support for a 4-year university in Snohomish County. She noted they were pleased with the success with auto theft and work occurring throughout the County on a 4-year university. She requested the Council's input on the 2008 priorities.

Mukilteo Councilmember Marko Liias explained Tier One items were those that progress was desirable during this legislative session. He identified Tier One issues:

- Support for coordination of Land Use Planning in Urban Growth Areas
- Oppose Statewide Franchises for Telecommunications
- Oppose Executive Session Recording

He also identified Tier Two issues:

- Support REET II flexibility
- Support 4-year University in Snohomish County

Ms. Gregerson encouraged the Council to provide feedback on these priorities. She explained the goal was to reach consensus on 1-2 issues for Snohomish County.

Mayor Haakenson pointed out that as presentations were made to cities in Snohomish County, the priorities may be tweaked slightly.

Mukilteo Councilmember Liias invited Councilmembers to a luncheon on December 11 at Everett Community College as part of the Snohomish County Cities newly elected officials seminar.

5. AUDIENCE COMMENTS

(1) Signals
Needed on
SR104; (2)
Neighborhood
Park; and (3)
Safeway
Property

Al Rutledge, Edmonds, commented in addition to a signal at 238th & SR 104, a signal was needed at SR 104 & Pine Street. Next he advised of the Snohomish County Supreme Court Case on February 28, 2008 regarding the neighborhood park. He then referred to Mayor Haakenson's column in the *Edmonds Beacon* regarding purchasing the Safeway property, and suggested the Mayor form a volunteer committee to consider whether there was sufficient interest in siting an events center in downtown Edmonds.

Six-Year Park
Program

Roger Hertrich, Edmonds, referred to the November 28 Planning Board meeting where the Board discussed the draft Six-Year Park Program. The program was designed to set goals and objectives, identify needs, set policy, create action plans and create projects which are grant eligible. Another of the goals was to develop parks as an economic generator for the City, and he suggested that goal be considered in regard to the properties near the waterfront. Another priority in the Program was to acquire park land, waterfront and open space. He noted park acquisitions were financed via REET funds. In addition, he noted the City did not charge a Park Impact Fee. He referred to the number of new residents in the Port Edwards project for whom the City must provide parks, yet they did not pay any Park Impact Fee. He suggested the Council develop a Park Impact Fee to provide an additional source of revenue for park acquisition. Concluding, he thanked the consultant for the presentation on the 196th Street SW/88th Avenue W intersection, noting it was one of the best consultant reports he had heard. He reiterated his recommendation to make incremental improvements to the intersection.

Park Impact
Fee

6A. BROADBAND PROJECT UP-DATE.

Administrative Services Director Dan Clements explained the Edmonds Fiber Network (EFN) was a high capacity fiber optic network potentially capable of providing digital phone, high definition television, and internet services from competing providers to every public entity, home and business in Edmonds. He provided an analogy of capacity: dial up was like a hypodermic needle (56K), DSL/Cable was like a garden hose (1.5 - 5 Mbps), the EFN Connection was like a 3-foot water main (100 Mbps) and the EFN backbone was like the Seattle bus tunnels (30 Gbps).

Mr. Clements reviewed the six goals for the project: (1) Help stabilize the City’s revenue base using a non-property tax approach; (2) reduce customers’ broadband costs; (3) help the City’s economic growth; (4) improve public safety; (5) provide better service and programming choices; and (6) reduce the City’s carbon footprint.

He identified three potential customer classes, (1) City of Edmonds governmental use, (2) local government, education, public health use, and (3) residential and business uses. He advised the business plan evaluated each use with regard to the six goals.

Mr. Clements highlighted key broadband project milestones in phase one:

December 2006	Broadband request for information issued
May 2007	NetRiver/Lynnwood launch customer
June 2007	Business Plan Proposal Award
September 2007	Fiber from City Hall to Public Works live
October 2007	Fiber connected to Westin and Internet
November 2007	City internet link converted to fiber
December 2007	Edmonds School District approves contract

The following upcoming actions were anticipated:

December 2007	Business Plan proposal delivered
January 2008	Stevens Hospital considers contract
February 2008	Edmonds Community College considers contract
February 2008	Business Plan combined with Municipal use

The City’s investment in the first phase included:

Date	Appropriation	Item
January 2006	\$120,000	Fiber run from Seattle Connection to WSDOT Business Plan
June 2007	\$ 56,000	Fiber Router Switching
Total	\$176,200	

Projected 2008 revenue:

Source	Appropriation
City Savings	\$ 10,000
PEG Customers (14)	\$234,000
Commercial (?)	?
Residential (?)	?
Total	\$244,000

Potential 2008 revenue with 30 commercial customers at \$36,000/year, noting the market potential was estimated at 1,000 commercial accounts with the existing equity:

Source	Appropriation
City Savings	\$ 10,000
PEG Customers	\$ 300,000
Commercial (30)	\$1,080,000
Residential (?)	?
Total	\$1,390,000

Mr. Clements reviewed the second phase decision timeline:

February 2008	Business Plan combined with municipal use (smart water metering, video arraignment, public safety WiFi, and field worker with WiFi).
February 2008	Clarification of Target Customers.
April 2008	Council considers Phase 2 of project (full or partial residential implementation, full commercial implementation and governance models).
May 2008	Council adopts Phase 2 Plan.

Councilmember Plunkett commented his recent conversation with Rick Jenness, Community Technology Advisory Committee (CTAC), helped him understand that by using the existing commercial investment the City could obtain additional commercial clients and a great deal of additional revenue, potentially \$10 million. Mr. Clements agreed, referring to the table that illustrated 30 commercial customers at \$36,000/year provided approximately \$1.1 million in revenue and more with the market potential of 1,000 businesses. Councilmember Plunkett suggested separating businesses and residential customers, noting further investment was required for residential customers.

Councilmember Plunkett commented there was additional commercial investment possible that the City could not yet consider due to legal issues. Mr. Clements stated the City had fairly clear statutory authority to provide service for public education and government. The State Attorney General has issued an opinion that 35A cities have the authority to provide services to businesses and residences; the financing needs to be clarified. Councilmember Plunkett commented if the City clarified the legal aspects, it had the opportunity with little additional investment to pursue commercial customers.

Council President Olson commented it was never envisioned that the City would make the financial investment for residential, other companies would have the opportunity to invest in residential services. Mr. Clements anticipated the business plan would identify the investment and income from residential. He noted the City may decide to have someone manage the network.

Councilmember Plunkett commented if the City provided residential service, the City would have to provide the hardware to the house. Mr. Clements agreed either the City or its agent who would be compensated by the City. Councilmember Plunkett summarized there were considerable costs associated with residential service.

7. AUTHORIZATION TO RENEW CONCESSION AGREEMENT WITH MILLTOWN PIZZA.

Concession Agreement

City Clerk Sandy Chase explained this was a one-of-a-kind agreement that the Council authorized approximately one year ago with Milltown Pizza to lease public right-of-way to vend pizza in a location in the vicinity of the ferry holding lanes. Richard Andrews, owner of Milltown Pizza, has made a request to renew the Concession Agreement for 2008.

Councilmember Wambolt asked if there had been any review of the \$100/month rental to determine whether it was appropriate. Ms. Chase answered no, as there were no other similar leases in the city.

Councilmember Dawson asked if anyone else had expressed interest in the concession. Ms. Chase and Mayor Haakenson answered no. Councilmember Dawson recalled that had been her concern when the Council first signed the agreement; since no one else had expressed interest, she supported renewing the concession agreement.

Councilmember Plunkett asked whether there had been any complaints. Mr. Chase answered neither she nor any other department received any complaints.

COUNCILMEMBER WAMBOLT MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER MARIN, TO AUTHORIZE RENEWAL OF THE CONCESSION AGREEMENT WITH MILLTOWN PIZZA. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. (The vote was 6-0; Councilmember Moore was not present for the vote.)

8. MAYOR'S COMMENTS

Thanks to City Crews for Storm Response

Mayor Haakenson expressed his thanks to City crews for the hours they put in over the week to address the snow, rain, wind and flooding. He noted these types of events, previously referred to as hundred year storms, were now occurring every five years. He noted five inches of rain produced a lot of water and it was difficult to build something to retain that amount of water. When creeks and streams were unable to enter Puget Sound, there was nowhere for the water to go and the water sought its own route. He noted Edmonds was also at the mercy of other cities particularly Lynnwood because all their water flowed into the city particularly through Perrinville Creek.

He noted City staff was also frustrated by their inability to control Lake Ballinger for Edmonds residents as Mountlake Terrace controlled the weir that let the water out and they could not let the water out because the downstream cities of Lake Forest Park and Kenmore were also flooding. He noted the bottom-line was it was created as a result of additional building and impervious surfaces that prevented the soil from absorbing the water.

9. COUNCIL COMMENTS

Port's Waterfront Winter Festival

Council President Olson invited the public to attend the Port's Waterfront Winter Festival on December 10 which will include the Christmas ship, caroling and Councilmembers roasting chestnuts and serving hot cider.

Housing Consortium

Councilmember Dawson advised of the Housing Consortium of Everett and Snohomish County breakfast on December 5 to discuss affordable housing topics. The meeting will include a presentation by a representative of the Gates Foundation regarding the results of the Sound Families Initiative in Snohomish County.

10. ADJOURN

With no further business, the Council meeting was adjourned at 9:50 p.m.