

EDMONDS CITY COUNCIL APPROVED MINUTES

April 2, 2013

The Edmonds City Council meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Mayor Pro Tem Lora Petso in the Council Chambers, 250 5th Avenue North, Edmonds. The meeting was opened with the flag salute.

ELECTED OFFICIALS PRESENT

Lora Petso, Mayor Pro Tem
Adrienne Fraley-Monillas, Council President
Pro Tem
Strom Peterson, Councilmember
Frank Yamamoto, Councilmember
Joan Bloom, Councilmember
Kristiana Johnson, Councilmember
Diane Buckshnis, Councilmember

ELECTED OFFICIALS ABSENT

Dave Earling, Mayor

STAFF PRESENT

Stephen Clifton, Community Services/Economic
Development Director
Carrie Hite, Parks & Recreation Director
Rob Chave, Acting Development Services Dir.
Frances Chapin, Cultural Services Manager
Rob English, City Engineer
Jeff Taraday, City Attorney
Sandy Chase, City Clerk
Jana Spellman, Senior Executive Council Asst.
Jeannie Dines, Recorder

1. ROLL CALL

City Clerk Sandy Chase called the roll. All elected officials were present with the exception of Mayor Earling.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

3. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

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

- A. **APPROVAL OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF MARCH 26, 2013.**
- B. **APPROVAL OF CLAIM CHECKS #201232 THROUGH #201325 DATED MARCH 28, 2013 FOR \$388,116.14. APPROVAL OF PAYROLL REPLACEMENT CHECK #60107 FOR \$40.83.**
- C. **LETTER OF SUPPORT FOR CANYON PARK TREATMENT SOLUTIONS.**

4. AUDIENCE COMMENTS

Roger Hertrich, Edmonds, referred to the stepback recommendation from the Planning Board and the obvious, arbitrary 30-foot height limit included in the charts. He was unable to find anything in the Planning Board minutes indicating 30 feet would be the new building height. He reminded Councilmembers of their election promises with regard to downtown building heights, recalling the building heights were 25 feet with an additional 5 feet allowed for other amenities, design, roofs, etc.

Ron Wambolt, Edmonds, relayed that Mr. Hertrich inappropriately spoke during Audience Comments regarding an item scheduled on the agenda as a public hearing and therefore should not be allowed to speak again during the public hearing.

Val Stewart, Edmonds, Vice Chair, Planning Board (PB), said she would refer to the PB's work but would also express her own opinions. The PB spent over 16 meeting hours working through the Harbor Square Master Plan (HSMP). She noted the challenge Council faces making sure the Port's original plan is respected and limiting the level of detail appropriate for inclusion in the Comprehensive Plan. The Council will have an opportunity to review a project action should that occur. A motion to deny the HSMP was defeated and now a revised Master Plan or revised Subarea Plan is being discussed that includes Council comments, addresses the PB's 14 amendments, and retains a portion of the original HSMP. She encouraged Council to refer to it as a revision out of respect for both the Port and PB and to build on the work that has been accomplished rather than tossing it aside. The HSMP was not called a "subarea" plan throughout the PB's meetings; that term was brought up later to afford more flexibility with regard to timing of adoption. The fourth criterion for qualifying the proposed amendment to the comprehensive plan was not addressed by the PB as there was not going to be a change to the comprehensive plan map. She posed several questions for the Council to consider during their review: What is the unique feature on the Port's property that everyone in this City values? Don't we owe it to future generations to fix the sins of the past or is it enough to just get to "no net loss"? While restoring what we all treasure, can't we come up with a version of the Plan that will be a draw not only for our Edmonds citizens but also for visitors? Why not allow residential? Just don't be specific. Wouldn't it be better to encourage a diverse housing mix especially to attract the younger creative class who honestly don't value having a car but seek places to gather, public amenities and transportation alternatives? Density does not necessarily equate with height. Imagine smaller units, fewer cars, and live work options.

She referred to the Planning Board's recommendation that any potential redevelopment go through a third party verified green building program. She thanked the Council for doing this challenging work for the greater good of citizens and the generations to come.

Mayor Pro Tem Petso requested City Attorney Jeff Taraday ponder whether a person who spoke under Audience Comments on a public hearing topic could speak again during the public hearing if he chose.

5. MAYORS DAY OF RECOGNITION FOR NATIONAL SERVICE PROCLAMATION

Paulette Jacobsen, Director, Retired Senior Volunteer Program (RSVP) at Catholic Community Services, explained RSVP is a retired and senior volunteer program, part of the Corporation for National Community Service. They had 1,000 volunteers in Snohomish County who supported 91 non-profits, providing 181,118 hours of service; 200 of the volunteers were from Edmonds. On April 9, Mayors across the nation will recognize National Service Volunteers. She introduced retired Advisory Council Member Linda McCullough.

Mayor Pro Tem Petso read a proclamation proclaiming April 9, 2013 as National Service Recognition Day, and encouraged residents to recognize the positive impact of national service in our city, to thank those who serve; and to find ways to give back to their communities.

6. **PUBLIC HEARING ON A DRAFT PROPOSAL TO AMEND THE EDMONDS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE (ECDC) TO APPLY DESIGN STANDARDS TO THE BD2, BD3 AND BD4 ZONES TO REPLACE THE REQUIREMENT FOR BUILDING STEP-BACKS. THE PROPOSAL ALSO INCLUDES A PROVISION EXEMPTING SMALL DECORATIVE 'BLADE SIGNS' FROM SIGN CODE AREA CALCULATION LIMITATIONS.**

Acting Development Services Director Rob Chave explained the Planning Board's original recommendation to remove the step-back requirements from the BD zones was made in 2011. The Council held a public hearing on July 26, 2011. In 2012, although supportive of replacing the stepback requirements in the BD zone with design standards, the Council wanted design standards in place before removing the step-back requirement. It was referred to the Planning Board and the Board has provided this recommendation. By way of background, he reviewed how height limits have changed over time:

- First zoning code in 1956: 45 feet
- 1964: 35 feet
- 1981: 30 feet
 - Pitched roof / modulated design / step-backs
- Codes since 1981 have addressed what happens in the 5 feet above 25 feet, but the 30-foot height limit has remained unchanged
- 2005 - step-back required to increase building height from 25 to 30 feet

Mr. Chave displayed photographs of buildings constructed prior to 1956: historic forms that still exist, noting there are common features such as first floor windows; pedestrian awnings; differentiation between the first floor and upper floor using materials and design elements; and rhythm or distinctive breaks in facades.

He displayed photographs of buildings constructed 1956 to 1981, what he termed as the "simplified box," unadorned with little architectural character. The solution in 1981 was 25 + 5 feet with some kind of design feature such as a pitched roof. He displayed photographs of buildings constructed 1981 to 1997, commenting they tended to be "buildings with hats." Beginning in 1997 there was a requirement for modulated buildings. He displayed photographs of buildings constructed 1997-2005, explaining the result was different roof forms and some attempt to differentiate vertical forms with a lot of repetitive elements. He pointed out there is a difference between building rhythm and breaking up a large façade into individual elements.

Mr. Chave summarized:

- Buildings prior to 1956
 - Pedestrian scale & orientation
 - A richness of materials & architectural detail
 - Vertical detailing
- 1956 to 1981
 - Larger scale, very simple buildings
 - Lacking in architectural detail
- 1981 to 1997
 - Some improvement in architectural detail
 - Pitched roofs as an add-on or afterthought
- 1997 to 2005
 - More architectural elements included
 - More attention to vertical elements
 - "Busy" horizontal elements

Mr. Chave noted one of the differences between historic buildings is richness in material and craftsmanship. Even when craftsmanship is not present, the details and rhythm of the buildings fit into the overall feel. Although buildings can be historic at 50 years old, he did not view many of the buildings constructed more recently as historic; they are typical of the period but not historic. While the concern in recent years has been height, it should be about design, the overall appearance of buildings and how they fit into the streetscape.

Mr. Chave summarized the existing code requirements:

- Retail core / BD1:
 - No step-backs
 - Mandatory design standards
- Other BD zones (BD2 – 4)
 - Mandatory 15-foot step-backs
 - Design objectives (not design standards)

The Board's recommendation is to remove the 15-foot stepback in the BD2-4 zones and replace it with design standards. He provided photographs of 15-foot step-backs in downtown Kirkland and Old Town Bellevue, noting they are typically on much taller buildings. He displayed photographs of Chanterelle's and the Edmonds Theater, commenting step-backs do not complement traditional commercial building styles. Using Chanterelle's as an example, he pointed out step-backs would not allow traditional buildings to be built. He explained the facades on historical buildings were viewed as a desirable downtown element. The intent is to adopt design standards that are consistent with some of the old building types and rhythms found downtown. He relayed downtown property owners have indicated the 15-foot step-back is a building killer and at least one developer concluded that a building utilizing that requirement was not feasible.

He displayed photographs of buildings that echo traditional building styles and new construction that often tries to duplicate traditional building styles such as Mill Creek Towne Center. The Board's recommendation eliminates the 15-foot step-back requirement in the downtown BD2, 3 and 4 zones and replaces it with the same regulations that work in the BD1 zone; a height limit of 30 feet and the BD1 zone design standards.

With regard to Mr. Hertrich's comment about being unable to find where the idea of 30 feet came from, Mr. Chave referred to the Board's January 9, 2013 minutes, page 8, 3rd paragraph, Board Chair Reed suggested to simplify the code language, 30 feet should be inserted. Mr. Chave noted this made sense because otherwise the language was convoluted with a base height of 25 feet with a 12-foot ground floor and the 12-foot ground floor was already required. He emphasized the 30-foot height was not a height increase.

Councilmember Buckshnis clarified the Council approved 25 +5 feet to a maximum of 30 feet in October 2012. Mr. Chave responded that seemed to be the consensus of the Council although the Council did not take formal action to approve it as the Council wanted to see the design standard language before taking final action.

Councilmember Buckshnis asked whether the Parks, Planning and Public Works Committee had reviewed this issue. Mr. Chave answered yes, at the outset of the process in 2011. The Planning Board had a joint meeting with the Architectural Design Board to discuss the design standards.

Councilmember Bloom asked when roof modulation was removed from the code. Mr. Chave answered it is still applicable in some parts of the City such as the BC zones in lower downtown including the Salish Crossing property. In 2005-2006, the idea of roof modulation was replaced with step-backs.

Mayor Pro Tem Petso referred to horizontal rhythm, noting large buildings not occupying entire blocks in the past. In recent years buildings are the size of an entire block without any horizontal modulation or rhythm. She asked whether the Planning Board's recommendation addressed that issue. Mr. Chave advised he would have to research that.

Mayor Pro Tem Petso observed BD5 was also being amended. Mr. Chave answered BD5 is the 4th Avenue Arts Corridor. The language for BD5 retains the step-back because that area needs a special process. There is already a 15 foot setback requirement for larger buildings in that area. Staff's recommendation to the Planning Board was to consider BD5 separately in the context of the plan that was adopted for that area because it is unique and needs to have its own rules.

Mayor Pro Tem Petso observed it appeared an extensive change was made to the BD5 language. Mr. Chave answered the language that was otherwise applicable to all the BD zones was retained for BD5. Although it looks like a big change in the markup copy, it is actually status quo.

Councilmember Buckshnis asked if the blade signs were reviewed by the Planning Board. Mr. Chave answered yes. He explained the intent is to make small signs that hang under awnings an easy process.

Mayor Pro Tem Petso asked whether the blade sign proposal was reviewed by the Parks, Planning and Public Works Committee. Mr. Chave answered it was not, this was the first presentation to the Council.

Councilmember Johnson asked how blade signs apply in the BD1 zone. Mr. Chave answered the same way as the other BD zones. The proposal is any blade sign under 4 square feet does not count against the overall signage. A business that wants a small blade sign simply undergoes a staff review to ensure there is enough clearance. There is no review of the overall building square footage and allowable sign space.

Councilmember Johnson observed the public hearing was in regard to BD2-4 and asked whether a separate process was necessary for the blade sign exemption for BD1. Mr. Chave answered the blade sign exemption was for the BD zones, not just BD2-4.

Councilmember Bloom referred to a Planning Board Member's question that it was "his understanding of the current code the additional height from 25 to 30 feet could only be achieved with a step-back. Eliminating the step-back requirement as proposed would mean a developer could achieve the maximum height with certain design accommodations. He asked what a developer might provide in terms of amenities or design features in order to obtain the maximum height. Mr. Chave answered the BD design standards provide illustrations that give a good idea of what would be expected." Councilmember Bloom asked whether it was the Planning Board's understanding that the design standards would be required to obtain the additional 5 feet in height and whether there had been any discussion regarding amenities that would be necessary to obtain the additional 5 feet. Mr. Chave answered the Planning Board agreed the design standards apply regardless of the building height.

Councilmember Bloom asked if the Planning Board discussed 25 + 5 feet with an additional amenity of some sort. Mr. Chave answered no; they focused on design standards that would apply consistently across the board. The idea of incentive zoning and other kinds of incentives was not discussed. There is some of that built into the BD zones; for example buildings over a certain size require open space be provided.

Community Services/Economic Development Director Stephen Clifton explained Roger Brooks' presentation talked about the importance of including blade signs on storefronts in the retail area. Blade signs are often used to attract pedestrians or drivers who do not see the storefront because they are traveling perpendicular to the front of the business. He displayed photographs of blade signs in Fairhaven, noting the design of the signs add to the attractiveness of the streetscape. Blade signs are typically much thinner than wall signs. He noted 3-4 businesses have approached him about installing a blade sign but do

not want to go through the sign process. The proposal is to allow a blade sign up to 4 feet and it would not count against the sign square footage allowed on the building façade. He summarized blade signs help pedestrians and drivers see businesses more clearly.

Council President Pro Tem Fraley-Monillas recalled Roger Brooks mentioning that blade signs often identify the merchandise or service a business provides. Mr. Clifton agreed Mr. Brooks talked about the importance of a business listing what they sell on the blade sign. Council President Pro Tem Fraley-Monillas asked why the blade sign issue was included with the design standards in the BD2-4 rather than separately. Mr. Clifton responded the Council directed the Planning Board to look at the design guidelines for the BD2-5 zones and it is very appropriate that the signage allowed in those zones be part of the design standards.

Councilmember Bloom recalled blade signs identify the product a business sells; the examples Mr. Clifton provided did not show that. She asked if that would be allowed? Mr. Clifton answered it would, noting blade signs can also hang from awnings provided they maintain a minimum clearance above the sidewalk.

Mayor Pro Tem Petso opened the public participation portion of the public hearing.

Doug Spee, Edmonds, a property owner in the BD2 zone, commented this is a very fair approach to the challenge to get development going downtown. He liked that the same design standards would apply to BD1-4. He noted the Council need not fear ugly or boxy buildings as the ADB review is a very challenging, effective process that, in his case, produced a better building. Once a developer complies with the design guidelines, they still must go through ADB review.

Finis Tupper, Edmonds, commented he was involved in the final adoption of the Comprehensive Plan and recalled the last element the Council worked on in 1981 was building heights. He recalled the Harbor building on Main Street was the driver for the 25-foot height. He noted Mr. Chave did not show the view of the Olympics and Puget Sound. The code was written to preserve the downtown area and the entire area was zoned BC. Another dimensional requirement in 1981 was that 51% of the building had to be commercial. Edmonds lacks commercial zones and more condominiums are being built than the City needs. He questioned whether the condominiums on 5th Avenue represented the small town character of Edmonds. If Councilmembers liked big, boxy buildings, he recommended they raise the building height from 25 feet to 30 feet tonight.

Roger Hertrich, Edmonds, clarified when he spoke under Audience Comments, he was speaking about elections, now he was talking about building heights that have been arbitrarily changed to 30 feet. He noted in the BD1 zone the height limit was raised due to the extra height of the first floor level; the BD2-4 zones were not required to have an increased first floor height. He recalled there were incentives in the past to create extra design features in exchange for additional height such as modulated rooflines, modulated building walls and sloped roofs. He summarized this was an arbitrary increase in height without any requirements.

Ron Wambolt, Edmonds, commented if Councilmembers did not support the proposed changes, it meant they liked the current situation. The current situation is not construction of an abundance of beautiful buildings; it is no buildings being built. He was a Councilmember in February 2006 when the new BD zones were implemented to replace the BC zone; no buildings have been constructed since then in a BD zone except for the rebuilding of two banks.

David Arista, Edmonds, owner of a building in the BD2 zone, expressed his support for the Planning Board's recommendation to replace the requirement for building step-backs. He does not plan to redevelop his building any time soon, but if he did in the future he wanted the opportunity to do so

without a step-back. He commented a 15-foot step-back did not make sense for a building 25-30 feet in height. He also supported the proposal to exempt blade signs, explaining blade signs are very helpful as drivers do not see the front of the building but a blade sign catches their attention.

Hearing no further comment, Mayor Pro Tem Petso closed the public participation portion of the public hearing.

Council President Pro Tem Fraley-Monillas asked the current height limit in the BD1-4 zones. Mr. Chave answered BD1 is 30 feet, BD 2, 3 and 4 is essentially 25 feet and the ability to go to 30 feet with certain things, mainly a step-back. That is why the Planning Board felt if they removed the step-back requirement, there was no reason to call it 25 + 5 anymore because $25 + 5 = 30$. In the BD4, there are two options, a commercial building that requires the 15-foot step-back or a multi-family building up to 30 feet with a front yard setback.

Council President Pro Tem Fraley-Monillas observed if the Council kept the height the same and removed the step-back, the height limits would be 30 feet in BD1 and 25 feet in BD1, 2, 3 and 4 zones. Mr. Chave answered that would essentially be lowering the height limit in the BD 2, 3 and 4 zones because there is no option to go from 25 feet to 30 feet. Council President Pro Tem Fraley-Monillas observed the only option currently to go from 25 feet to 30 feet is the step-back. Mr. Chave agreed.

Council President Pro Tem Fraley-Monillas asked if the option to go from 25 feet to 30 with a step-back was adopted because of building modulation. Mr. Chave answered the genesis of the step-back was a concern with the appearance of the street front. At the time there was a feeling that somehow 25 feet provided a more pedestrian-friendly environment; historically what makes more sense is the design rather than imposing an artificial step-back. That is evident in the design of historic buildings. The primary focus of the Planning Board and ADB Members' discussion was that design is important and the step-back does not really produce good design and in fact is not consistent with historic designs.

Council President Pro Tem Fraley-Monillas asked whether design standards instead of a step-back could be required to go from 25 feet to 30 feet in the BD2-4 zones. Mr. Chave answered under the Planning Board's proposal, design standards would be required regardless of building height. Design standards address variation in material, detailing on facades, etc.

Mayor Pro Tem Petso asked if horizontal modulation was addressed. Mr. Chave answered not directly; there is discussion about materials and differentiation of facades, but nothing that sets an absolute number when one portion of the building transitions to another and no horizontal standard is included. Mayor Pro Tem Petso observed adopting this tonight would not provide any improvement for a building that runs the full length of the block. Mr. Chave answered it would, such as the detailing that enhances the façade. There is just not a specific standard that addresses horizontal spacing although that would be relatively easy to add. He referred to the first page of the design standards (page 83 of the packet), 22.43.010 Massing and Articulation, A. Intent. To reduce the massiveness and bulk of large box-like buildings and articulate the building form to a pedestrian scale. A sentence could be added something like "buildings shall echo historic horizontal building spacing or building elements consistent with the historic pattern of the city." He noted it would be different on each block or façade depending on the historic pattern. He referred to the photographs of historic buildings where there is a distinctive difference between one section of the building frontage and another.

Mayor Pro Tem Petso asked whether that would need to go back to the Planning Board or could it be included in the ordinance for approval by Council. Mr. Chave answered the intent is there; if a majority of the Council wanted to include that language, it could be included in the ordinance.

Mayor Pro Tem Petso referred to Mr. Chave's statement that the BD1 building height is 30 feet, yet when she looked at the table in the packet, 25 is crossed out and replaced with 30. She noted it appeared a change was being made to BD1. Mr. Chave answered buildings in BD1 are required to have a 15-foot ground floor; with a 15 foot ground floor, the building can be 30 feet tall; therefore, from a practical standpoint, the height limit in BD1 is 30 feet. That was why Planning Board Chair John Reed recommended changing the table.

Mayor Pro Tem Petso observed the same change was being made in the table for the BD2, 3 and 4 zones, changing 25 feet to 30 feet. She asked if it would be possible to eliminate the step-backs, adopt the design standards and not change the table, leaving the height limit at 25 feet. Mr. Chave answered yes, but it would mean no possibility of going from 25 feet to 30 feet. Mayor Pro Tem Petso agreed pointing out the extra 5 feet could be achieved via a development agreement, incentive zoning or other ideas that have been discussed. Mr. Chave advised that would require a separate process.

Councilmember Bloom observed open space was required for a larger bulk building. Mr. Chave agreed. Councilmember Bloom recalled being at Council meetings when the Gregory Building was approved where citizens were in opposition to the building design. The former City Attorney said three errors were made by the Planning Department in approving the building but nothing could be done because an appeal had not been filed during the 21 day LUPA period. She recalled one of the errors was related to open space. Mr. Chave responded he was not directly involved with that project but recalled there was split zoning on the property and a bay window that extended beyond the façade that was not picked up during building review. There was nothing regarding open space at the front of the building. The provisions in the BD zones that he referenced earlier, page 11 of the zoning chapter (page 79 of the packet), Open Space Requirements, for buildings on lots larger than 12,000 square feet or having an overall building width of more than 120 feet, at least five percent of the lot area shall be devoted to open space, is a new requirement that was not in place until the BD zones were adopted. The intent of the open space requirement was to encourage pocket open spaces along a building frontage, particularly larger buildings such as a full block. There is also language regarding where the open space should be located. It is not an incentive; it is a requirement for a large building. The discussion regarding the Gregory Building was related to the back of the building.

Councilmember Bloom observed there are a number of buildings that have been built under the current 25 + 5 building code that many citizens have not been happy with, including Old Milltown and the Gregory. She was agreeable to eliminating the step-back but was concerned with eliminating 25 + 5 without any tradeoff for the additional 5 feet. She was also supportive of blade signs. She appreciated Mr. Spee's comments tonight and at the Planning Board that there is a lot of fear. She noted the fear is due to buildings that have been constructed that citizens have had issues with. Mr. Chave responded the ADB and Planning Board looked at it differently. From a practical standpoint, they felt the height limits were established at 30 feet and the discussion is really about the overall façade and design of the building, not what occurs above 25 feet.

Councilmember Bloom asked what the highest part of the Gregory Building is, recognizing that portions of buildings can be higher than the height limit due to the topography. Mr. Chave answered the overall height of the Gregory was 30 feet. He referred to the photo of the building with the curved roof which looks like a 2-story building at the street, but is a 4-story building down the hill. The opposite happens on the other side of the street where the uphill slope is behind the building. The Gregory appears taller because it takes advantage of the slope behind the building. That is a function of the way height limits are calculated and the topography. There has been discussion in the past about establishing height limits at the street front; but that was not done because it was such a huge change.

Councilmember Bloom asked how tall the front of the Gregory Building is. Mr. Chave guessed it was 33-34 feet and the back of the building was less than 30 feet. Councilmember Bloom observed that was the

reason citizens view this as a height increase; some buildings seem quite large due to the topography. Mr. Chave agreed a building's height calculation depends on the site's topography.

In response to the comment that the City was not getting anything in return, Mr. Clifton assured the City was getting something in return – BD1 design standards applied to the BD2–4 zones. He noted the BD1 design standards were adopted after the development that Councilmember Bloom referred to. The two developments that have occurred since then, the banks, particularly the one at 3rd and Main Street, would not have been allowed under the proposed design standards because they do not reflect the desired downtown urban form. The bank building looks like it belongs in a suburban office park; it would have been better to gut the existing building and build around the façade than to build that building. He found it interesting that the Council was fearful when they had already approved BD1 guidelines that require a 15-foot first floor ceiling height which allows a 30-foot building in the most concentrated and intimate area of the downtown, but did not want to allow that in the rest of downtown. He noted the intent of the BD1 design standards was to require building design and construction that reflected the architectural style that many in the community find attractive such as the Beeson building, Chantrelle's, Edmonds Theater, the Starbucks building, etc. He found the 15-foot step-back arbitrary and had never understood why it was imposed.

Main Motion

COUNCILMEMBER YAMAMOTO MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER PETERSON, TO APPROVE THE PLANNING BOARD'S RECOMMENDED CODE CHANGES AND DIRECT THE CITY ATTORNEY TO PREPARE AN ORDINANCE FOR CONSENT AGENDA APPROVAL TO INCLUDE THE PROVISION EXEMPTING SMALL DECORATIVE BLADE SIGNS FROM SIGN CODE AREA CALCULATION LIMITATIONS.

Councilmember Peterson commented by adopting the design standards, it is no longer a tradeoff, it is forcing good design which is a great step toward ensuring buildings fit the feel of downtown. Although not anti-development, the design standards are the City showing a heavier hand and requiring good building design regardless of the height. As Mr. Clifton pointed out, these design standards are required in BD1, a zone that citizens are adamant about protecting, and it makes sense to expand them to the surrounding zones.

Amendment #1

MAYOR PRO TEM PETSO MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER BLOOM, TO AMEND THE MOTION TO ADD A SENTENCE THAT THE BUILDINGS SHALL ECHO HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT HORIZONTALLY.

Mayor Pro Tem Petso referred to Mr. Chave's indication that it would be a simple matter to ensure buildings demonstrate horizontal rhythm by adding a sentence to the ordinance. Mr. Chave responded the intent is stated in the code. He displayed a picture of a block that reflected building rhythm, noting the additional language would not prohibit or otherwise restrict construction of a large building, but it would address the façade and appearance at the street.

Vote on Amendment #1

UPON ROLL CALL, THE AMENDMENT CARRIED (5-2), MAYOR PRO TEM PETSO AND COUNCILMEMBERS PETERSON, FRALEY-MONILLAS, BLOOM, AND JOHNSON VOTING YES; AND COUNCILMEMBERS YAMAMOTO AND BUCKSHNIS VOTING NO.

Amendment #2

MAYOR PRO TEM PETSO MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER BLOOM, TO AMEND THE MOTION TO ELIMINATE THE STEP-BACKS, ADOPT THE DESIGN GUIDELINES BUT LEAVE THE BUILDING HEIGHTS AT 25 FEET.

Councilmember Peterson reiterated the design standards were created with a great deal of public input for the most intimate area of the City, around the fountain, and he did not understand the reasoning behind Mayor Pro Tem Petso's motion. He pointed out many of the buildings on the Historic Register could not be built with a height limit of 25 feet. If the goal is an historical element, which he supports, he questioned how that could be accomplished with this motion.

Councilmember Bloom recalled during a past discussion there was an indication that incentive zoning was included in the Comprehensive Plan. She asked if the option for incentive zoning applied to all zones. City Attorney Jeff Taraday advised the City Council always adopts incentive zoning anywhere in the City it wished. Councilmember Bloom asked what would be required to adopt incentive zoning to allow an additional 5 feet with certain amenities. Mr. Taraday referred to the memo his office prepared regarding incentive zoning, explaining there needs to be a careful balance between the public benefit that is sought and the deviation that the City is willing to accommodate. The tradeoff only works if the benefit and deviation are in balance; just the right amount of public benefit and just the right amount of incentive to the developer. That needs to be carefully considered and he was uncertain that there had been any analysis regarding how much going from 25 to 30 feet was worth economically and what a developer would be willing to provide in the way of an amenity to gain the additional 5 feet in height. The drafting of the incentive is a simple process; the analysis of whether it will actually work to generate the amenity has not been done with regard to an increase from 25 to 30 feet.

Councilmember Bloom asked whether development agreements could be used to allow an additional 5 feet and get something in exchange. Mr. Taraday said staff could be asked to develop a proposal that would accomplish that and bring it to the Planning Board for review and ultimately to the City Council.

Councilmember Johnson commented she had been following this issue for some time and it was both simple and confusing. In the interest of clarity for elected officials, developers, staff and citizens, Planning Board Chair Reed suggested changing the minimum height from 25 feet to 30 feet. It was her understanding the building height was 30 feet prior to the adoption of step-backs and it will be 30 feet once the step-back requirement is eliminated, yet the table indicates the height is 25 feet. At the very least, this is a PR nightmare. She suggested being clear about what the standards were, what they are and what they will be. She agreed the 15-foot step-back was not a good idea. She referred to Figure 16.43.4 that illustrates uphill and downhill examples, observing that depending on the topography, the frontage could be above 30 feet. She summarized the goal was improved communication between advisory boards and the City Council; her preference would have been for the Parks, Planning and Public Works Committee to have reviewed the Planning Board's recommendation so that there could have been an in-depth discussion with staff. In the interest of expediency and because this has been discussed since 2011, she supported making a decision tonight.

Councilmember Buckshnis echoed Councilmember Johnson's comments that the goal was clarity and pointing out $25 + 5 = 30$ feet. The proposal simplifies the regulations. She referred to Roger Brooks' suggestion #5, keep it simple. The amendment would require buildings to echo historical horizontal design. She agreed this is a PR nightmare in that this has been going on since 2011. She summarized the step-back was being removed and building heights were not being raised because $25 + 5 = 30$ feet.

Council President Pro Tem Fraley-Monillas disliked step-backs particularly in shorter buildings. She spoke in favor of blade signs. She supported the amendment to keep building heights at 25 feet.

Vote on Amendment #2

UPON ROLL CALL, THE AMENDMENT FAILED (3-4), COUNCILMEMBERS FRALEY-MONILLAS AND BLOOM, AND MAYOR PRO TEM PETSO VOTING YES; AND COUNCILMEMBERS PETERSON, YAMAMOTO, JOHNSON AND BUCKSHNIS VOTING NO.

Mayor Pro Tem Petso said she will not support the main motion; in order for her to support the main motion, both amendments would have needed to pass. She thanked everyone for their work on this; the positive is improved design standards will be adopted and they will be further improved before final adoption via the amendment.

Councilmember Bloom echoed Mayor Pro Tem Petso's comments, stating she supported the removal of the step-back requirement and supported blade signs but would vote against the main motion due to the 30-foot height limit.

Councilmember Johnson expressed her support for extending the BD1 design standards to the BD2, 3 and 4 zones.

Vote on Main Motion

UPON ROLL CALL, MOTION CARRIED (4-3), COUNCILMEMBERS JOHNSON, YAMAMOTO, BUCKSHNIS AND PETERSON VOTING YES; AND COUNCILMEMBERS BLOOM, FRALEY-MONILLAS, AND MAYOR PRO TEM PETSO VOTING NO.

Mayor Pro Tem Petso declared a brief recess.

7. EDMONDS STRATEGIC ACTION PLAN – PRESENTATION OF DRAFT FINAL REPORT.

Community Services/Economic Development Director Stephen Clifton reported the Planning Board (PB) and Economic Development Commission (EDC) conducted a joint meeting open to the public on January 23, 2013. The City Council was also invited. The purpose of the meeting was to provide an opportunity for Beckwith Consulting Group (BCG) to present information related to a Draft Strategic Action Plan Report dated December 21, 2013. PB and EDC members asked questions and discussed next steps with Mr. Beckwith.

Following the January 23, 2013 joint PB/EDC meeting, Mr. Beckwith submitted a revised Draft Strategic Action Plan dated February 8, 2013 to the City. The document was forwarded to the City Council, PB and EDC members, City staff, Chamber, Senior Center, etc. The document was also provided to the Strategic Action Plan subcommittee consisting of City Council/PB/EDC members and City staff. All entities were asked to review the document and provide comments.

On March 5, 2013, the Strategic Action Plan Committee met to discuss the February 8, 2013 document. During the meeting, the committee focused primarily on BCG's proposed five strategic objectives, related plan actions, who/which entity would perform in a lead capacity and as participants, etc. Using comments provided during the meeting, revisions were made to the document and clean/redlined versions were again provided to City Council, PB and EDC members, City staff, Chamber of Commerce, Senior Center, and others and each was asked to provide comments by Friday, March 22, 2013. The redlined document and comments submitted by reviewers were then sent to BCG to give them time to review and prepare the final draft products for the April 2, 2013 City Council meeting.

The purpose of tonight's meeting is to provide Tom Beckwith an opportunity to present information related to the Final Draft Strategic Action Plan. Following the presentation, the City Council may be interested in conducting a public hearing on the Final Draft Strategic Action Plan or the Council could approve the Plan tonight in order to begin implementation.

Mr. Clifton introduced **Tom Beckwith, Beckwith Consulting Group**, who introduced **Steve Price, Beckwith Consulting Group**. Mr. Beckwith provided an overview of the Strategic Action Planning process:

Purpose

- Why?
 - Economic trends impacted Edmond’s fiscal sustainability requiring the city to make strategic decisions about services and projects that reflect citizens’ desires and aspirations.
- What?
 - Short (3-5 year) and midterm (5-10 year) actions by the city and all other possible participant parties with which to integrate Comprehensive Plan, Capital Facility Program (CFP), and annual city budgets.
- Who?
 - Community organizations and interest groups, business owners, employees, customers, young adults, the public at large, and finally a random survey of registered voter households.
- How?
 - Overview by 31 member Joint Committee composed of City Council, Economic Development Commission (EDC), and Planning Board (PB).
- Result?
 - 86 specific actions with citywide priorities, lead agents and participants, schedules, and performance measures (plus 2 added but not ranked).

Process – Six joint Committee Retreats

- Retreat #1: Validated the process and scope of work
- Retreat #2: Reviewed demographic/socioeconomic scans
- Retreat #3: Reviewed fiscal trends in Edmonds and Washington cities and Budgeting for Objectives (BFO) approach
- Retreat #4: Reviewed results of the focus group sessions, surveys of businesses, employees, customers, young adults, and residents; the 3 public charrettes, and the open house
- Retreat #5: Reviewed results of the open house survey and refined the contents of the random sample survey of registered voter households
- Retreat #6: Reviewed results of the random sample survey of registered voter households and the implementation process

Process – Public Outreach

Focus group sessions	20 focus group sessions (Appendix B)	96
Adult resident survey	mail-back and internet (Appendix C)	681
Business owner survey	mail-back survey (Appendix D)	219
Employee survey	mail-back and internet (Appendix E)	86
Customer survey	mail-back and internet (Appendix F)	484
Young adult	mail-back and internet (Appendix G)	119
Charrettes	2 adult and 1 young adult (Appendix H)	150
Open house	hand-back and internet (Appendix I)	213
Voter survey	random sample controlled mail-back and internet (Appendix J)	466
Total	Participations (including some multiple events per person)	2,514

Mr. Beckwith reviewed the result of the Strategic Action Planning Process.

Strategic objectives (the 86 action tasks are organized around these five)

1. Economic health, vitality, and sustainability
 - a. Foster a dynamic and diverse economy
 - b. Take advantage of special and unique characteristics
 - c. Enhance economic and employment opportunities
 - d. Build on the community’s history, heritage, natural resources, and livability to promote Edmonds as a tourist destination
 - e. Effectively develop, market, and promote Edmonds arts and cultural heritage and brand (Arts & Culture)

- f. Promote a permit and licensing process to promote business recruitment, expansion, and retention
2. Maintain, enhance, and create a sustainable environment
 - a. Build a community that balances protection, economic health, and social needs
3. Maintain and enhance Edmonds community character and quality of life
4. Develop and maintain a transportation and infrastructure system to meet current and future needs
 - a. Create efficient, effective, and balanced transportation system to meet current and future needs
 - b. Provide quality services, facilities, and infrastructure
5. Responsible, accountable, and responsive government
 - a. Provide efficient and effective delivery of service
 - b. Promote and encourage an active and involved community
 - c. Ensure a safe and secure environment for residents, businesses, and visitors

Mr. Beckwith reviewed an example of an action task which includes the lead, ranking, complexity, months, strategic objective, participants, implementation schedule, and potential performance measures. Next, he reviewed Strategic Action Plan Implementation Particulars:

Strategic actions and priority or rank

- Who defined the strategic action tasks?
 - Public input from focus group sessions, surveys, and charrettes helped define the actions that were desired to be accomplished within the next 10 years in the city regardless of who would be the implementing agent.
- Who defined the priorities and what were they?
 - Voter household survey ranked each and every action on a scale of 1-5 where 1 was the lowest and 5 the highest priority. The scores were grouped into 1-2, 3, and 4-5 scores then ranked where 4-5 scores were:

68%-50% = very high	29 = 34%
49%-40% = moderate-high	24 = 28%
39%-32% = moderate-low	15 = 17%
32%-21% = low	15 = 17%
21%-13% = very low	3 = 3%
- What are the financial implications of the task priorities?
 - The action tasks, including some of the city tasks, do not compete for the same source of funds. Many of the action tasks will be accomplished by parties with funds other than the city – Port, WSDOT, Chamber, etc.
- What do the priorities signify?
 - The priorities indicate voter household opinions of the overall priority of each and all actions on a citywide basis (e.g., the survey sample) for accomplishment within the next 10 years regardless of who would be the implementing agent or the source of financing.
- How will the city use the priorities for city actions?
 - Where the city is the lead agent, the priorities will be used in the Budget for Objectives (BFO) process to determine how the city’s limited financial and staff resources will be budgeted or allocated amongst the city’s lead actions.
- How will the priorities be used where the city is not the lead?
 - Depending on whom the lead agent(s) is, the organization will likely follow the same process as the city in determining how to allocate resources to accomplish the action tasks.
- Will the action tasks be accomplished in rank order?
 - Not likely nor should that be an objective. Some of the action tasks will require lead times necessary to form participant groups, secure outside funding, conduct environmental reviews, etc. Consequently, even if a task is a high priority it may take a number of months or years to fully initiate and achieve results.
- Should a low priority task be ignored or deferred?

- Not if the lead agent is successful in getting it accomplished or primed for accomplishment. The Strategic Action Plan is opportunistic and multifaceted looking to implement as many community desired actions as possible involving as many participant interests in the community as possible as events and circumstances allow.
- Should the list of action tasks be reduced or tasks eliminated?
 - It is not necessary to eliminate an action if it scores a moderate-low to very low priority if there is an interest group who is willing to take the lead and implement the action without unduly using city funds or resources. The Strategic Action Plan is holistic defining all actions city residents wished to see accomplished within the next 6-10 years without limitations on who would be the party to implement or fund them.

Complexity

- What does complexity mean?
 - Complexity refers to the degree of ease or difficulty that may be involved in implementing each action task. Low complexity tasks may involve a single implementing agent following a simple process. High complexity tasks may involve multiple agents, including where the city is not the lead or the authorizing agent, and a complex process that involves public participation, environmental assessments, permits, hearings, and other procedures.
- Who determined complexity?
 - A subgroup of the Joint Committee and Department Directors determined the complexity assessments ranging from low, moderate, high, and very high.

Months and Implementation Schedule

- What do months mean?
 - Months refer to the probable production time involved in implementing an action task accounting for the specific steps that would be involved in implementing an action task and its degree of complexity. An ongoing entry indicates the action task is a continuous activity.
- Who determined months?
 - A subgroup of the Joint Committee and Department Directors determined the probable number of months that would be involved in each task.
- How do months relate to an implementation schedule?
 - The Strategic Action Plan defines the action tasks desired to be implemented within the next 6-10 years. The schedules shown assume each task would be initiated as soon as possible and extend through the number of months assigned to the task. In reality, actual schedules will depend on who the lead agent is, how many other tasks they are responsible for, what complexities are involved in the implementation, when funding is available, and other opportunistic variables.

Participants and Lead Participants

- Who are the participants and how were they determined?
 - The participant lists include all parties who will be affected by or on an individual action task. The lists were determined from the focus group sessions, survey comments, charrettes, and by the consultants and staff.
- Who are the lead agents?
 - The lead agents are assumed to be the primary implementing party, where there is a single agent, or the facilitating and implementing parties where there are multiple leads. In some instances the lead agent may be the authorizing or approving agent – as in City Council. How were the lead agents selected?
- How were the lead agents selected?
 - In some instances lead agents were self-selected based on the actions they proposed during the focus group sessions, survey comments, or charrettes. In other instances, the lead agents

are presumed to be the most likely party who has the predominant interest and benefit in the action, and the resources with which to accomplish or facilitate the action with other affecting or affected participants.

- How did the action task priorities distribute where the City is the lead agent versus others?

Lead Agent	VH		MH		ML		L		VL		Total	
Edmonds Only	10	12%	8	9%	9	10%	8	9%	0	0%	35	41%
Edmonds w/other leads	13	15%	8	9%	3	3%	3	3%	1	1%	28	33%
Other leads w/Edmonds	4	5%	2	2%	2	2%	2	2%	1	1%	11	13%
Other leads only	2	2%	6	7%	1	1%	2	2%	1	1%	12	14%
Total	2	34%	6	28%	1	17%	2	17%	1	3%	86	100%

- How are the lead agents distributed between the city and others?
 - Though Edmonds elected officials and staff are involved in a large number of action tasks, they are not the lead or primarily implementing party in a large number of them – such as in the business district development, arts and culture, hospital, etc.
- Who are the other lead agents?
 - There are a large number of other public agents (Port of Edmonds, WSDOT, Sound Transit) and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs – Downtown Edmonds Merchants Association, Chamber of Commerce) listed as lead agents who have authority, responsibility, or benefit from an action task for which they are listed as lead.
- Will this require additional organizations?
 - It could, depending on who the participants and the lead agents determine will be most effective and representative of the costs and benefits.
- What will result if the lead is not interested or able?
 - Then the lead will pass to another interested party or parties or the action will not be accomplished.

Performance Measures

- What are the suggested performance measures?
 - The performance measures are indicators or benchmarks by which to measure the progress and effectiveness of the implementation of each action task. A low score on a performance measure indicates the action task is not achieving the desired result and may need to be reassessed or revised to achieve the results listed in the performance measure.
- How were the performance measures determined?
 - The performance measures were defined by existing city benchmarks, by comparison with benchmarks from other cities, and from objective parameters defined by the nature of the action task function. Additional performance measures may be added as action tasks are further defined and implemented
- How will the performance measures be gauged?
 - Some of the performance measures are objective measurements – i.e., the number of tons recycled per year, miles to the nearest park, etc. Others depend on community surveys where the public indicates the degree to which they are satisfied with various conditions – such as perception of safety, access to jobs, satisfaction with appearances, etc.

Strategic Action Plan Updates

- When will the Strategic Action Plan be updated?
 - Ideally, this Strategic Action Plan defines key objections, tasks, responsibilities, schedules, performance measures, and other particulars for the next 6-10 years concurrent with updates to the Comprehensive Plan, Capital Facilities Program (CFP), and annual city budgets. However, should an unforeseen event require, the Strategic Action Plan can be updated if and when City Council deems necessary.

Mr. Beckwith described initiating the Strategic Action Plan – what to do next:

- Finalize the draft document and complete Council hearings.

- Review and confirm action task complexity, months, lead agents, participating parties, schedules, performance measures, and other particulars with which to initiate action. To the question whether the Council needs to adopt or approve the plan,
- Confirm suggested lead agents and participants.
 - Assign the action tasks to the lead agents and work with them, city included, in formulating detailed contents, schedules, funds, and other particulars. Where necessary, create new ad hoc groups to take the lead on tasks involving multiple lead agents and interests.
- Coordinate with other city, public agency, and NGO programs.
 - Update city documents including the Comprehensive Plan, CFP, annual city budgets, and other agency and NGO plans, projects, and programs to reflect the strategic objectives, action tasks, and performances defined in the Strategic Action Plan,
- Monitor performance and adjust particulars as necessary.
 - Score and evaluate performance of each lead agent and participants on the accomplishment of the action tasks using the performance evaluation measures or benchmarks to make adjustments, revise approaches, and other particulars.

To the question whether the Council needs to adopt or approve the plan, Mr. Beckwith explained adopt means it becomes a formal document. He preferred the Council approve the Plan to give staff some direction about what they wanted to achieve and so that the non-public players have a sense that it is okay to pursue their objectives.

Mr. Beckwith reviewed what can be initiated in the next 12 months:

- Pending update to the Park, Recreation & Open Space (PROS) Plan.
 - Could initiate work on up to 17 action tasks including Anderson Center, Yost Pool, Senior Center, Civic and Woodway Fields, youth activities and participations, off-road trails, on-road bike networks, and a parks fiscal sustainability strategy among others where Parks is the lead, shares the lead, or may facilitate others.
- Pending update to the Cultural Arts Plan (CAP).
 - Could initiate work on up to 10 action tasks including branding and themes, market surveys and promotions, central clearinghouse, cultural arts website, and funding 4th Avenue cultural corridor, among others where Cultural Services Division is the lead, shares the lead, or may facilitate others.
- Pending update to the Cultural Arts Plan (CAP).
 - The PROS and CAP planning process could initiate work on 27 of the 86 identified actions tasks or 31% of the total tasks over the next year!

Mr. Beckwith provided examples from the Chehalis Renaissance Project:

- What is the Chehalis Renaissance Plan?
 - A citywide plan with projects in community building, economic development, quality design, traffic and parking, and downtown development.
- What is the overall goal – the bottom line?
 - Make the Chehalis area a more attractive place in which to live, enhance job opportunities and involvement of youth, increase tourism traffic, and grow the retail base to enhance local shopping.
- What is the mission of the Chehalis Community Renaissance Team (CCRT)?
 - Driven by voluntary leadership, broad community participation, and using disciplined project management - implement the Council-approved plan.
- What is different about the Chehalis Renaissance Project and the Chehalis Community Renaissance Team (CCRT)?
 - Driven by volunteers – the city is a partner.
 - Counts on and encourages citizens to provide leadership and work in partnership with CCRT.

- Relies primarily upon private investments and donations.
- Success is a combination of many small, some medium, and a few large projects.
- A chance for citizen volunteers to put a permanent stamp on the Chehalis area.
- 21 active CCRT members.
- CCRT has completed 21 action tasks to date.
- CCRT is working on 15 projects.

Mr. Beckwith summarized the message to the community at large is that we are in this together. This is not the community defining their wishes and then asking when they will get done.

Councilmember Buckshnis commented Edmonds already has a number of volunteer groups that do a variety of things. She asked who becomes the ringleader and if it would be Mr. Clifton. Mr. Beckwith answered the ones where the City is the lead, a lead will have to be identified. For example if it is related to parks, the lead will be Ms. Hite or if is related to arts, the lead will be Ms. Chapin.

Councilmember Buckshnis referred to Roger Brooks' presentation and his recommendation to get rid of the Strategic Plan and have an Action Plan instead. She asked Mr. Beckwith his thoughts on that, recognizing this was an Action Plan. Mr. Beckwith explained when planning first began in the 1960s, it was very process oriented. The public is comfortable with that process. The trend now has been what is being done/achieved. The City has plenty of documents that identify the goals and vision; the community wanted to identify specific issues they wanted done or improved upon. The difference between a Strategic Plan and an Action Plan is this plan emphasizes who is responsible, how success is measured, how complex it is, how to get started, etc. He summarized this plan is a complement to other efforts.

Mayor Pro Tem Petso relayed one of her concerns is the presence of so many low priority items on the list for which the City is the lead. Her concern was these items would divert staff time away from things that were not identified in the questionnaire but were of importance to the Council. For example pages 14-15 of the Strategic Action Plan have four low priority items regarding making code amendments to encourage mixed use development in various parts of town. Those items did not generate a lot of support and she was concerned staff would not be working on the code rewrite if they were working on these low priority items. The code rewrite has been underway for several years and offers the potential to reduce land use litigation and ensure good development and fair treatment. She asked how the Council could be sure time was not diverted to low priority items in the Strategic Action Plan and away from other important business. Mr. Beckwith answered the original task was to create mixed use standards citywide. For the purposes of the survey, it was broken into ten different areas. He noted regulations were usually not a high priority but respondents identify with the area they live. He suggested not pursuing them as ten different areas, but rather as consolidated development regulations that address those areas. Some of the items will also be utilized in Budgeting For Objectives including the use of resources, budget availability, staff availability to determine which items are pursued. He did not expect the low priorities to be addressed in that process unless it was something that was easy, low hanging fruit. For example, wayfinding signs have been designed and just need to be funded. That would achieve a very visible result very quickly and show momentum although it is not one of the highest priorities.

Mr. Price added the action items came out of the various citizen-based charrettes. The intent of the charrettes was to determine what the community thought was important. The comments from the charrettes were grouped by the consultant and staff into 86 tasks. Whether they are rated low, they were mentioned by the community as an item they wanted to see action on. Although a task may have been rated low compared to other tasks, it was identified by the community. He summarized in a way all the tasks are worthy of undertaking.

Mayor Pro Tem Petso referred to the relocation of the Senior Center that generated 44% of the lowest possible ranking. She was concerned with adopting a Plan that included that as a task when it was not a

top priority. She wondered whether that 44% would have said they did not want to include it as a task if they had been given that option. Mr. Beckwith explained the reason the registered voter survey was done at the end was to determine prioritization of City funds. If something is a high priority, consideration needs to be given to how to use City funds on that task and if it is a low priority, that is an answer when someone asks why an item is not being pursued. With regard to the Senior Center, not all the respondents use the Senior Center and he would not expect the entire city to rank that as a high priority. The question did not say City funds would be used; it said the City may help facilitate what happens there but the seniors must pay for it. Although it is a low priority citywide, he cautioned against removing it and suggested the seniors be allowed to determine how to do it.

Council President Pro Tem Fraley-Monillas asked if the Strategic Action Plan was a roadmap for Budgeting By Priorities/Budgeting For Objectives. Mr. Beckwith explained one of the strategies in Budgeting For Objectives is to ask departments to develop a strategy for achieving an action with an emphasis on alternatives; some objectives will require a multi-departmental action plan to achieve it. He noted in the first year of Budgeting For Objectives, most cities keep it internal, allow only city departments to bid and later allow non-city entities to bid. He noted the Strategic Action Plan focused on what citizens wanted to achieve that they thought was not being done. There are a number of tasks that would need to be included in Budgeting For Objectives that were not considered problems that needed to be addressed such as infrastructure, public safety, etc. and actions still need to address those. Budgeting For Objectives is much more comprehensive than only the tasks in the Strategic Action Plan.

Councilmember Johnson noted Mr. Beckwith was able to easily identify the three lowest priorities and asked if he could identify the top 10-12 priorities among the 29 top priorities. Mr. Beckwith answered that would be difficult off the top of his head; noting each category contained 2-3 tasks that were ranked very high. Of the very high tasks, 29 involve only the City; the majority involves the City helping someone else.

Councilmember Johnson wanted to be able to identify the highest priorities and to easily communicate them. There is a tremendous amount of information in the Plan but summarizing it is very difficult because it includes 86 different action tasks. Mr. Beckwith responded the highest priorities are identified on pages 4, 5 and 6 of the Strategic Action Plan. The highest priorities are distributed between categories and have diverse lead agencies. He encouraged the City to look to other partners. For example in Chehalis, the city designed a wayfinding sign program, but the Port, Chamber and Economic Development District paid to implement it.

Councilmember Johnson advised the appendix identifies both mandatory and discretionary services. Mandatory services included public safety, utilities, streets and some general services; discretionary services include parks and recreation, cultural services and library. She was concerned with balancing the responsibility to operate the City and the priorities in the Strategic Plan in Budgeting For Objectives. Mr. Beckwith responded one of the issues, even without the recession, was the initiative that limited property tax increases to 1%/year. The legislature requires the city to fund mandatory services first but innovative ways can be considered to fund discretionary services. For example, he suggested going back to the community to ask how to pay for them such as a general levy lid lift, a levy lid lift dedicated to a specific purpose, a Metropolitan Park District, etc.

Mayor Pro Tem Petso observed there were two alternatives, 1) approve or adopt the plan, or 2) hold a public hearing.

Councilmember Buckshnis asked why a public hearing needed to be held when the Strategic Plan was the result of a great deal of public involvement. Mr. Clifton clarified it was not staff's recommendation to hold a public hearing; he listed tonight's presentation as an action item in the event the Council wanted to conduct a public hearing.

COUNCILMEMBER BUCKSHNIS MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER YAMAMOTO, TO APPROVE THE STRATEGIC ACTION PLAN.

Mayor Pro Tem Petso preferred to hold a public hearing despite the extensive public process to create the plan. She pointed out it has been a long time since the survey was done and the questions determined. She would like to hear whether there were any serious objections to the tasks that were ranked as low priorities and which of the very high priorities were truly the most important to citizens. She did not support approving the Plan tonight for those reasons.

Councilmember Peterson expressed his support for the motion, pointing out the Plan would never be perfect; there would always be tasks that someone does not like. The public input, including the telephone survey, were legitimate ways to hear from the public. He was pleased with the rankings and felt it was time to move forward and get other players outside City government involved. He noted most of the items on the list would come back to the Council.

Councilmember Buckshnis pointed out the Strategic Action Plan is a living document, priorities may shift and not all 29 high priorities could be accomplished in one year. There are a tremendous number of volunteer groups in the City that are willing to help and are just waiting for the opportunity. She supported approving the plan tonight.

Councilmember Johnson commented Beckwith Consulting Group conducted an extensive public outreach; more people were involved in this process than was anticipated. It is a snapshot in time; what people thought when asked these questions, participated in the charrette or attended a public meeting. As a Strategic Action Plan the Council is not obligated to any decisions; it reflects the work done for this plan.

THE VOTE ON THE MOTION CARRIED (6-1), MAYOR PRO TEM PETSO VOTING NO.

8. MAYOR'S COMMENTS

Mayor Pro Tem Petso had no report.

9. COUNCIL COMMENTS

Councilmember Buckshnis reported she will be out of town in Charlotte, North Carolina, for the April 9 and 16 Council meetings. The Parks, Planning and Public Works Committee meeting will be held on April 8 at 4:00 p.m. at City Hall. The meeting will include review of the WRIA 8 pre-application for the Edmonds Marsh, special event contracts, development agreements and incentive zoning.

Councilmember Buckshnis wished Jack Bevan a Happy Birthday, noting he helped her with the Adopt-A-Park project as well as Adopt-A-Flower Basket and Adopt-A-Flowerbed.

Council President Pro Tem Fraley-Monillas thanked the City for the Mayors Day of Recognition for National Service Proclamation. She encouraged everyone to volunteer their time for whatever cause they chose.

Councilmember Peterson thanked staff, particularly Mr. Clifton, Ms. Hite, Ms. Chapin and others who put a lot of time into the Strategic Action Plan. Next, he reported Mayor Earling and the Sister City Commission, a delegation of 24 Edmonds residents, are visiting Hekinon, Japan. This is the 25th anniversary of the Sister City relationship with Hekinon.

Councilmember Johnson congratulated former Councilmember Jack Bevan who celebrates his 90th birthday today.

10. **CONVENE IN EXECUTIVE SESSION REGARDING PENDING LITIGATION PER RCW 42.30.110(1)(i)**

City Attorney Jeff Taraday explained the executive session was only an update and could be delayed until the next regular Council meeting.

COUNCILMEMBER PETERSON MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER YAMAMOTO, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

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

This item was not necessary as the Council meeting was adjourned without the Council meeting in executive session.

12. **ADJOURN**

The Council meeting was adjourned at 9:50 p.m.