10. CALL TO ORDER – The Special Meeting of the City of Lynnwood Transportation Benefit District (TBD) Board, held in the Council Chambers of Lynnwood City Hall, was called to order by Board President Simmonds at 6:00 p.m. on April 29, 2013.

20. ROLL CALL
   Board President Loren Simmonds
   Board Vice President Sid Roberts
   Board Member Kerri Lonergan-Dreke
   Board Member Mark Smith
   Board Member Van AuBuchon
   Board Member Benjamin Goodwin (arr. 6:28)
   Board Member M. Christopher Boyer

   OTHERS ATTENDING
   Public Works Director Bill Franz
   Deputy PW Director Elekes
   Project Manager David Mach
   Council Assistant Beth Morris

   Board President Simmonds noted he had received notice from Board Member Goodwin that he had to work until 6:00 p.m. but he would come as soon as he could.

30. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – Special Meeting March 25, 2013

   Motion made by Board Member Boyer, seconded by Board Member Smith, to approve the minutes of the March 25, 2013 Special Meeting as presented. Motion passed unanimously.

40. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION: TRANSPORTATION PLANNING, FUNDING AND COMMUNITY EDUCATION/OUTREACH

   Public Works Director Franz made a presentation summarizing the discussion from the March 25 Special Meeting and soliciting feedback on three specific policy questions as follows:

   1. Does the Board support staff’s recommendation to conduct a Community Education and Outreach Plan as outlined in the packet?
   2. Does the Board support staff’s recommendation to reconvene the Transportation and Traffic Task Force as a focus group to provide guidance in implementing a Community Education and Outreach Plan?
   3. Depending on the outcome of #2 above, should a City-wide survey specific to transportation be conducted? Staff recommends using a specialized consultant for this task.

   Public Works Director Franz stated that they have heard an interest from the TBD Board in exploring different funding options for the transportation needs they have talked about many times. He reviewed that the Board has already adopted a $20 per vehicle tab fee bringing in roughly $500,000 a year. That can go up to as much as $100 with a voted measure by the public. Another option is a sales tax option which would allow up to .2% by voted measure.
He commented that staff has heard that the Board might be interested in running something in 2014, and there are many steps that need to happen ahead of that including significant public education and input. He stated that there are bills that are being looked at in the legislature right now on funding transportation statewide. He expressed concern that parts of that bill would allow transit agencies to put on the ballot up to .3%. This could impact how the Board thinks about putting a similar measure on the ballot. On the other hand, the City of Stanwood passed a TBD measure for .2% sales tax in February with a high majority of the vote. Staff will examine what Stanwood did as part of their process.

Board Member Lonergan-Dreke asked what was being funded in the Stanwood package and what their current sales tax rate was. Director Franz did not have those specific details, but indicated that staff would find out.

Board Member Roberts asked how the task group was formed. Director Franz said there were about 15 to 20 people. It was an outgrowth of the visioning group along with others from the community including property owners, developers, and people from the MUGA.

Board Member Lonergan-Dreke expressed concern about convening the task group again because of the narrow focus of the group and her belief that the group isn't necessarily representative of the average person who is going to be voting. She was hesitant to take more time with that as opposed to really getting out to the folks who are likely to make the decision. She would like to see the community outreach started sooner.

Board President Simmonds responded that the people who made up the task force were major stakeholders in the City. The group did produce a fairly reasonable game plan that they thought was a legitimate consideration. He recommended distributing that document to the Council to get a sense who was there and what their thoughts were. Staff indicated they would provide that. David Mach added that the majority of the people on that task force were residents. He noted that it took a long time to educate them and bring them up to speed with the complexities of the topic. By continuing with the same group they would bypass a lot of that time and education. He acknowledged that they might not be the best representation of people who would actually be voting on a measure of this sort, but they are well educated on the topic, could hit the ground running, and could provide meaningful feedback. Board Member Boyer suggested that another way that group could be an asset would be to help in the education process of the broader electorate.

Deputy Public Works Director Jeff Elekes reviewed the possible schedule to get to a ballot measure as shown on page 40-11 of the packet. He noted that convening the task force could occur over the summer months. August could potentially be a touch-base meeting back with the Board and possibly the task force to outline a plan to move forward with an education program. At the second annual regular meeting in October, staff was proposing to amend the budget one way or another with the hopes of bringing a consultant on board who could do a scientific survey. Concurrently, right after the first of the year, there would be a couple community outreach meetings along with a survey going out to the broader community. Whatever the results of those are, they would come back to the first meeting in March to review the status of the process. Toward the end of the outreach process they would actually have a community survey. Around May staff would discuss the survey results with the
Board and decide whether or not to go forward with a vote in November. He reminded the
Board that there is a minimum of 84 days before the measure that formal paperwork must be
submitted. Assuming that they might be going to a vote, there would be more informational
meetings to continue the education process in August, September and October. He noted that
the consultant could cost somewhere from $30,000 to $70,000 to bring up to speed and put a
survey together.

Director Franz referred to the task force and stated he thought out of the 15 members of the
task force they might be able to get 5 to 10 of them to come to a meeting. He welcomed
ideas for other good candidates to bring into that group, even those who were opposed to
additional taxation in order to get an idea of what their thoughts might be.

Board Member Smith asked for an explanation of the table on page 40-12. Staff explained
that it showed the projects, the costs, and the funding sources. Board Member Smith pointed
out that the assumption includes a license tab fee of $100 and the full .2% sales tax. Deputy
Director Elekes concurred and noted that if they maxed all those revenue options they could
generate the equivalent amount of the need. With the existing sources there would be a
deficit of $127 million over the 20-year period.

Board Member Smith said he spoke about levels of service at the last TBD service. He is
increasingly uncomfortable allocating huge sums of money to road projects when there is
limited land in the City of Lynnwood. Specifically, he is not supportive of increasing the
number of lanes or putting in new roads until there is a thorough review of the level of
service. Similarly, his support of moving ahead with any revenue packages is predicated
upon looking at and possibly adjusting levels of service and possibly eliminating some of
these projects. On the other hand, he understands the need to take care of the infrastructure
and improving it where they can. If they go out for a revenue package, he would like to see it
tied to a specific list of projects.

Director Franz stated that this is the major list of projects that gets the City to its growth
targets over the long period and is contingent upon the growth happening over the 20-year
period. If the City was to go back and reassess the level of service as suggested by Board
Member Smith, it would wipe out the schedule that Deputy Director Elekes shared with the
Board. Board Member Smith said he wasn't concerned with meeting the timeline. He noted
that these projects are only needed to meet the growth targets because of the levels of service
the City has. Deputy Director Elekes responded that the level of service combined with the
type of land use that the City wants is the reason for the needs. He referred back to the
bubble diagram which explains the process for determining all this. He pointed out that
when they did the City Center they changed the level of service from a D to an E and as a
result pulled out over $70 million worth of improvements. He stated that the level of service
throughout the city can be looked at if that is the Board's or Council's desire even though it
would cost time and money. Director Franz added that a lot of the projects on the list are
non-motorized or capacity, but they still have a very pressing need on capital infrastructure
maintenance which is mainly overlays, but also includes traffic signals and so forth. In staff's
opinion they are $1 million a year short even with the funding they do have. He urged that
they do not put off those more pressing needs.
Board Member Smith stated it is not economically prudent or sustainable to keep putting this much money into asphalt. Also, with regard to levels of service, he wondered if they ought to have a letter lower than F since level of service F only means you have to wait through one cycle of the signals or beyond. Maybe on some arterials, people shouldn't expect to get through a signal in one cycle. Deputy Director Elekes stated that the Council can set whatever level of service they choose.

Board Member AuBuchon asked if staff has looked at other forms of raising revenues besides putting it on the backs of the citizens. He noted that other jurisdictions charge higher rates on car tabs based on such things as total vehicle weight, number of axles, etc. As the size and weight of the vehicle goes up people pay a higher amount because they are doing more damage to the roads. Staff replied they have not looked at that. Director Franz said he was not sure if that was an avenue that was available to cities. What the legislature has allowed is the TBD model. Deputy Director Elekes stated that the other things they have contemplated are on page 40-12. The very last column has variables including Levy Lid Lift, General Fund, and an Economic Development Infrastructure Program. Board Member AuBuchon pointed out that there are a lot of commercial vehicles using the roads every day that don't pay a thing to Lynnwood. He thought there should be some ways to have those folks pay their fair share.

Board Member Roberts said he doesn't see any harm in asking the citizens what they think about it. He stressed the importance of maintaining the infrastructure whether they add to it or not. He likes the idea of tying revenues to projects where they can. He thought that if CT comes to the voters it would be to refund the Sunday transit service. Finally, he added that car tabs don't address all the users of the roads. It only addresses the people who live here. Deputy Director Elekes concurred and said staff had suggested that the car tabs could be applied toward local projects such as residential paving, sidewalks, or connector links, while the sales tax would be for everybody else who comes and uses it.

Board President Simmonds pointed out that next year will be another budget cycle, and the transportation funding issue will raise its head again. He thinks that it is imperative that the Board moves forward with some recommendations that are going to result in additional or added revenues to help take care of, at the very least, what we already have and possibly some items in addition to that. He suggested that that they go back and revisit the visioning statement and see to what extent the issue they are talking about is reflected in that visioning statement. He commented that slow crowded streets are not tolerated very well by the public. He thinks they need to move forward with the concept of conducting a community education and outreach plan. He believes that there is a value in trying to reassemble the group that is probably the best equipped right now to help the City with these issues. He also suggested bringing the task force in to talk with the Board.

Board Member Lonergan-Dreke concurred with Board President Simmonds' comments. In her experience and with the visioning statement, transportation has been one of the top items that people talk about being important to them in the city. She agreed that they need to do something and stop sitting around the table thinking they know what people want instead of asking them. Community outreach is critical in her opinion. She spoke in support of incorporating the task group members to the process. Board Member Lonergan-Dreke said
she liked the idea of having the task group come talk to the Board and being part of the outreach and focus groups. She also suggested that they utilize the City's website more effectively and use E-news to communicate with citizens, especially regarding the survey. In the community outreach meetings she thinks they should come up with a list of priority projects that the citizens want and are willing to fund. Also, taking care of what they already have is right at the top of the list because it's only going to get more expensive if they don't. Those are the kind of complaints she hears most frequently, in addition to long waits at traffic lights. Personally, she doesn't find traffic to be too bad most of the time; it is the broken up roads that are more of a concern to her.

Board Member Boyer commented that while Board Member Smith raised some important issues about continued expansion of roads, they are not presupposing all of that in the educational outreach. He spoke in support of the community outreach plan, using the previous transportation task force, and ultimately, using a consultant if warranted. He stated that they will know what is important to the voters of Lynnwood once they hear from them. He was in support of getting the conversation started and seeing where it goes.

Board Member Goodwin encouraged staff to move forward. The community education and outreach plan is an important part and seems to be a consensus with Council members as well as the administration. He was in support of using the traffic task force as a focus group to help provide the guidance in implementing an outreach plan. Depending on the outcome of those two things, he might be in support of looking at the survey and using a consultant if that is what the public appears to want.

60. ADJOURNMENT

Board President Simmonds stated that the next regular TBD Board meeting would be on October 14; however, it is likely that a special meeting probably will be called before that.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.