



CITY OF SNOHOMISH

Founded 1859, Incorporated 1890

116 UNION AVENUE λ SNOHOMISH, WASHINGTON 98290 λ TEL (360) 568-3115 FAX (360) 568-1375

NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING

SNOHOMISH TRANSPORTATION BENEFIT DISTRICT

in the
George Gilbertson Boardroom
1601 Avenue D

TUESDAY
February 7, 2012
6:00 p.m.

AGENDA

- 6:00 1. **CALL TO ORDER**
- a. Pledge of Allegiance
 - b. Roll Call
- 6:05 2. **APPROVE AGENDA** contents and order
- 6:10 3. **CITIZEN COMMENTS** on items not on the Agenda
- 6:20 4. **ACTION ITEM – SELECT** Chair and Vice Chair (*P. 1*)
- 6:30 5. **DISCUSSION ITEM** – Summer 2012 Street Preservation Update (*P. 3*)
- 6:40 6. **CONSENT ITEM – APPROVE** the minutes of the regular meeting of November 1, 2011 (*P. 5*)
- 6:45 7. **OTHER BUSINESS/INFORMATION ITEMS**
- 6:50 8. **ADJOURN**

NEXT MEETING: Tuesday, March 6, 2012, regular meeting at 6 p.m., in the George Gilbertson Boardroom, Snohomish School District Resource Center, 1601 Avenue D.

The City Council Chambers are ADA accessible. Specialized accommodations will be provided with 5 days advanced notice. Contact the City Clerk's Office at 360-568-3115.

ACTION ITEM 4

Date: February 7, 2012
To: Transportation Benefit District Board
From: Larry Bauman, City Manager
Subject: **Board Selection Process for Chair and Vice Chair**

The terms of the current TBD Board Chair and Vice Chair expired on December 31, 2011. It is scheduled at this time for the Board to select from the current Board members two individuals to serve in the roles of Chair and Vice Chair for two-year terms. There are many ways to accomplish this and meet the requirements of state law. However, due to the expectation that the Board will want to follow recent past practice of the City Council to allow for written ballot voting, it is required that a motion should first be made to waive regular procedures, which normally require all votes to be by voice.

The selection process that has been used by the Board calls for the current Chair to serve as the Presiding Officer and begin the process of chairing the first meeting in February by facilitating the Board's selection of the Chair. The procedure for this selection is proposed as follows:

1. The Presiding Officer (i.e., current Chair) will accept nominations from members of the Board. Once seconded, the nomination(s) will be accepted for a vote. The Board will vote for those nominated via written ballot and pass their ballots to the Chair. The Chair will then announce the votes and the City Clerk will tally the votes for the record.
2. There will be only one vote per Board member. If a majority is not reached in the first round, the Board will deliberate and repeat the process from the point of nomination. Once a candidate receives a majority, the Chair will announce, "It appears Candidate X has been selected."
3. At this point, the Chair may look for a "motion to appoint" with a second. The Board will then vote to appoint the selected Board member as Chair. This will give the entire Board the opportunity to vote for the winning nominee.

Once elected, the new Chair will chair the rest of the meeting and immediately follow the same procedures to select the Vice Chair.

STRATEGIC PLAN REFERENCE: N/A

RECOMMENDATION: That the Transportation Benefit District Board first **APPROVE** a motion to waive procedures to allow vote by written ballot and then **NOMINATE** and **ELECT** the Chair and Vice Chair to serve until the first Board meeting in 2014.

ACTION ITEM 4

DISCUSSION ITEM 5

Date: February 7, 2012
To: Transportation Benefit District Board
From: Steve Schuller, City Engineer
Subject: **Summer 2012 Street Preservation – Project Update**

BACKGROUND: At the November 1, 2011, Transportation Benefit District (TBD) meeting, the Board approved four proposed areas for the 2012 street preservation construction program. The TBD Board prioritized each area to assist staff in determining which areas would make it into the 2012 program based on the funds available. By the time summer's drier weather arrives, when a preservation project should be constructed, it is expected that the TBD will have accumulated approximately \$250,000, about half the funds of a normal year.

As part of each TBD street preservation project, the City will look at what utility replacement projects should be performed. The utility replacements are recommended so that the road will not be excavated again at a later date after the pavement restoration has been completed. The utility portion of the projects will be paid from the separate utility funds, as outlined in the cost estimates below.

PROJECT STRATEGY: Staff recommends that we bid each project listed below as a separate schedule that may or may not be awarded. After the project is bid, the City will determine which projects can be accomplished within the budget and only award that work. Below are the proposed projects, by the TBD Board's priority ranking:

Project No. 1 – Terrace Avenue and 16th Street Intersection. Grind, grade, and install new asphalt section. Preliminary cost estimate is \$40,000 using TBD funding.

Project No. 2 – Road reconstruction of a portion of Tenth Street, between Avenue B and Avenue D. TBD funding would include removal of existing evergreen tree with roots damaging roadway section, and grind, grade, and install new asphalt section. Storm utility funding would include installation of storm drainage infrastructure. Preliminary Cost Estimate is:

Tree Removal and Tree Planting Mitigation	\$ 5,000 (TBD funds)
Storm Utility Improvements	\$ 12,000
TBD Improvements	<u>\$ 40,000</u>
Total Project No. 2	\$ 57,000

Project No. 3 – Road reconstruction of Avenue A between Fourth and Fifth Streets, including both intersections. TBD funding would include installing ADA curb ramps, replacing failing curb and gutter, and asphalt surfacing. Utility funding would include replacing sewer, water, and storm drainage. Preliminary Cost Estimate is:

DISCUSSION ITEM 5

Water Utility Improvement	\$ 120,000
Sewer Utility Improvement	\$ 130,000
Storm Drain Utility Improvement	\$ 60,000
TBD Improvements	<u>\$ 215,000</u>
Total Project No. 3	\$ 525,000

Total TBD preliminary cost estimate for Projects 1, 2, and 3 is \$300,000. This includes a contingency of approximately 10%. It is staff's hope that the bidding climate and oil costs will remain favorable, and all three projects will be able to be funded within the \$250,000 TBD budget. Based on the bids received, staff will prepare an approved package for TBD Board/City Council approval using a combination of Projects 1, 2, and 3 that fit the 2012 TBD budget.

A fourth project (No. 4) is also recommended to be considered as part of the bid schedule. Project No. 4 would be road reconstruction of the Tenth Street and Avenue A intersection. Preliminary cost estimate is \$65,000 for sewer replacement and \$50,000 for TBD improvements. Unless the bidding climate is extremely favorable, it is unlikely at this time that it will be within budget.

At the TBD meeting, staff will conduct a PowerPoint presentation that will provide more details on each project's design elements, including specifics on ADA ramps, curb replacements, reconstruction areas, and utility (storm line, catch basins, water main, and sewer line) replacements.

NEXT STEPS: Based on the Board's input tonight, staff will prepare bid plans and specifications for advertisement in late spring. After bids are received and assuming an apparent low bidder is approved by staff, the project would go to the TBD Board/City Council for award in early summer 2012. It is anticipated that construction would begin in July.

STRATEGIC PLAN REFERENCE: Goal 4.C., "Significantly Increase City Funding for Street Maintenance," and its Action Strategy, "Identify and evaluate funding alternatives for roadway improvements," are directly related to this item.

RECOMMENDATION: That the Transportation Benefit District Board **DISCUSS** the proposed 2012 street preservation construction projects.

ATTACHMENTS: N/A

CONSENT ITEM 6

Snohomish Transportation Benefit District Board Minutes November 1, 2011

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman Hamilton called the Snohomish Transportation Benefit District Board meeting to order at 6:00 p.m., Tuesday, November 1, 2011, in the Snohomish School District Resource Service Center, George Gilbertson Boardroom, 1601 Avenue D, Snohomish, Washington.

BOARDMEMBERS PRESENT

Derrick Burke (*arr at 6:03*)
Melody Clemans
Greg Guedel
Karen Guzak
Tom Hamilton, Chairman
Dean Randall
Lynn Schilaty

STAFF PRESENT

Larry Bauman, City Manager
Thom Graafstra, City Attorney
Danny Weinberg, Support Services Dir.
Tim Heydon, Public Works Director
Torchie Corey, City Clerk
Steve Schuller, City Engineer

There were three citizens in attendance.

2. **APPROVE AGENDA** contents and order
3. **CITIZEN COMMENTS** on items not on the Agenda

Morgan Davis, 206 Avenue I, spoke with Mr. Heydon and Mr. Schuller on October 27th about overlaying the 50-yard gravel shoulder near the intersection of west First Street and Second Street. Paving or overlaying an existing shoulder should be considered street maintenance like overlaying gravel potholes or reconstruction and would therefore be eligible for TBD revenue. Mr. Heydon said TBD revenue could not be used to fix that existing shoulder. Mr. Schuller explained that the federal government said the 50-yard gravel shoulder couldn't be paved due to wetland mitigation and that it would take a year of red tape to get a waiver. If City government could find resources to help fund the Monroe water-boarding recreational facility at Lake Tye, it could surely find resources to improve public safety at the west riverfront trail in town. Please ask Mr. Heydon for an update on his study of the west First Street issue and about the possibility of TBD funding in 2012 for the gravel shoulder.

Chairman Hamilton said that issue would be addressed under 2012 projects.

4. **PUBLIC HEARING** – 2012 Budget Adoption

This public hearing was to consider the Transportation Benefit District's first budget. In August voters approved the sales tax increase to fund street maintenance and two intersection projects. Revenue was expected to begin next March from the increased tax being imposed January 1, 2012. Staff was conservatively projecting about \$50,000 a month.

The budget proposal being looked at included \$500,000 in revenues. Considering the timing, some overlay projects would begin along with some initial design work performed in-house for the two intersection projects. The total budget was \$500,000 in revenue, with expenditures of \$457,000 with the balance to become ending fund balance at the end of 2012. This budget was terrific, following the long lead-up and all the work everyone did.

Citizens' comments - none
Citizens comments – closed

CONSENT ITEM 6

MOTION by Guedel, second by Guzak, that the Transportation Benefit District Board conduct the public hearing to receive public testimony regarding the 2012 budget, and adopt Ordinance 1 to implement the 2012 Budget. The motion passed unanimously (7-0).

5. ACTION ITEM – ADOPT 2012 TBD Projects

Staff was very excited to have a dedicated funding source for road preservation that couldn't be used for anything else. If roads weren't preserved, the cost for reconstruction was 10-15 times more for the same street. Voter approval of a ten-year plan to preserve roads was huge!

Later this winter staff would return with a database of all the different components so the Board could make some major decisions on how to address the ten years, but tonight's topic was 2012. There would be about half the expected \$500,000 because the money would start coming in late and staff was conservative about how fast it would be collected. The four areas identified would take more than \$250,000 so Board prioritization would determine which projects would be done in 2012. If there were other areas the Board wanted to consider, please let staff know.

It would be very important to get out and make the projects visible next summer. There will be good signage and information on the webpage to make sure people see results from their vote last August and know where their money is going.

Most of the projects were not classic preservation with just an overlay. Many roads were in such bad shape reconstruction would be needed. Pavement and maybe even base rock would be dug out where it no longer provided proper structure. New rock would be brought in and then laid with new pavement. It will be much more expensive as smaller projects focused on areas in such bad condition that the City needed to get to work on them.

Arterials were really important because those streets got the most traffic. Local roads were very important also but didn't get as much traffic nor serve as many visitors, businesses and citizens.

Chairman Hamilton asked to have Mr. Davis' question addressed. A number of 2011 projects got new curb, gutter and sidewalks. Now there were expanses of gravel road because the street was widened out to the right-of-way from what had been the original pavement. The Combined Sewer Overflow project and Fifth Street near the Maple Avenue Campus got new sidewalks.

Mr. Schuller said a number of questions would come to staff and the Board about transportation projects. Many would be good projects to do but the question will be whether proposed projects could be TBD-funded. One question would be 'when does a project become a new project and when is it a preservation project?' That discussion should be held with staff and legal counsel.

Mr. Bauman added part of the answer related to what the public was told. That was an important part of how Public Works staff responded to Mr. Davis' suggestion to use TBD funds to expand the roadway for pedestrian use at First and Second Streets. The public was clearly told that TBD funds will be utilized for two types of projects: preservation and regular maintenance of existing streets beyond what staff alone could accomplish, and to improving two specific intersections. That was consistently included in the public information throughout the process and election.

CONSENT ITEM 6

Chairman Hamilton asked if the 2011 projects would be eligible in the future because of the potential erosion due to bad weather, and how well the gravel shoulders will stand up against the winter elements.

Mr. Schuller said staff worked diligently to get as much community benefit out of the CSO project as possible. Those dollars couldn't be stretched any more. The City got a wonderful project that served as more than a sewer project. Regarding the area Mr. Davis referred to, a lot of consideration was given to the First/Second Streets intersection. It did not meet standards but it was made a lot better than it was within the constraints of the sewer project. Many citizens had said it was safer now. That area was within a defined wetland buffer. The City spent over a year getting permits from the Corp of Engineers and needed to be really sensitive to what was done before making improvements in the middle of the buffer. The City defined and finished the project; turned in the wetland report; and now would have to do an annual report on the wetland project. It had federal, state and local oversight so there were additional complexities.

Chairman Hamilton was familiar with all the project areas proposed, frequently driving in Area 4 (*16th Street/ Terrace Avenue/Holly Vista/Cypress Lane*) and walking a lot along Avenue A.

Boardmember Randall was on Tenth Street and Avenue A practically every day so was familiar with the condition of the roads and projects in Areas 1, 2 and 3. (*Area 1 – Avenue A between Fourth/Fifth Streets*) (*Area 2 – Tenth Street between Avenues A/D*) (*Area 3 – Avenue A between Tenth/13th*). He was rarely in Area 4 so asked about the condition of 16th/Cypress Lane.

Mr. Schuller pointed out it was the only area that was not an arterial. It was picked because the street was in really poor shape and not even road-worthy in places. There was rutting, sinking utility trenches, cracking, and potholes that had been patched multiple times. The area was off the beaten path but also served county customers to the north. It wouldn't all get fixed but some of the worst areas would be addressed.

Boardmember Schilaty knew it was fairly densely populated with several housing developments and the Chalet so there was a lot of traffic. The street had deteriorated to the point of not even feeling like a road in some places.

Boardmember Clemans also travelled that road and hoped to improve as much of Terrace as possible. It was very close to Holly Vista Drive. Could that street be helped to any extent?

Mr. Schuller said it would depend on how the Board prioritized the Areas. There was only money for a couple priorities so if Area 4 ended up being priority 4, it was unlikely. There was \$250,000 and all four areas could easily use up \$250,000 and more. He confirmed that Holly Vista Drive was included in the Area 4 project.

Boardmember Guzak would select Area 1, 2, or 3 because those were the most visible. Her first choice was Area 1 but would like to include Fourth Street from Avenue A to Union Avenue as part of the project. Those two blocks were really bad and she perceived them to be worse than Avenue A in this section. That part of Avenue A was also very narrow so she assumed the right-of-way wouldn't be changed.

Mr. Schuller said there had been in-house preliminary design discussions on Avenue A between Fourth and Fifth Streets. Eastside curb would likely have to be replaced and new stormwater put in where the drainage went because the first rule of road building was 'a

CONSENT ITEM 6

beautiful road could be built but if water got into the road, it destroyed itself.’ As the water came up everything got contaminated, resulting in potholes. Drainage was very important to good road condition.

Boardmember Guzak thanked staff for putting in the four-way stop at Fourth and Avenue A. It significantly improved the safety of that intersection where the sight-lines were bad.

Boardmember Randall also thought Area 1 was very important as part of the bike-lane area. That location was very narrow but there probably wasn’t enough money to fix that right now. However he was glad staff was looking at it for the future.

Boardmember Schilaty said whenever they looked at road repair it became a question of what area was worthy enough. All the proposed areas were a priority but it was important to remember other parts of the community that weren’t within the most visible historic downtown area that needed attention. Those were parts of the City and those residents were citizens too. She was inclined to see Area 4 as a priority although she agreed with adding the additional blocks to the Avenue A project. Less visible projects might be a priority because they sometimes got ignored.

Chairman Hamilton said Area 4 was important but had some geographic challenges. The turn onto Terrace from 16th was sharp and the area carried a lot of water that led to erosion. Tenth Street was also important because of its volume of traffic. Areas 1 and 3 were important and heavily used, but were also relatively flat although there could be a lot of water drainage, particularly in Area 1 from the west side. Areas 4 and 2 were priorities for him.

Boardmember Clemans would also put Area 4 as number one. It was heavily travelled and was in very bad shape. She wasn’t sure if it had received much maintenance other than a patch here and there. The water runoff was pretty bad and probably why the road was so bad with cracks and potholes. Area 2 on Tenth Street was also a significant area. There was no question that all four were important.

Boardmember Randall asked about Avenue A between Tenth and 13th. It looked like the City had recently done a lot of crack-sealing there and improved the roadway at least temporarily.

Mr. Schuller said the crew had done a fantastic job keeping up with crack sealing even without the preservation program for the last three years. That area of the road probably wasn’t as bad as those crack seals will probably hold up for several years. The intersection of Tenth/Avenue A was in worse condition which could either be part of Area 2 or Area 3.

Boardmember Guzak said Tenth was another narrow street without curb and gutter. Would curb and gutter be part of the preservation project?

Mr. Schuller said generally not. The only possible replacement on Avenue A would be between Fourth and Fifth Streets on the east side where the curb was sinking. The project was not to put in new curb and gutters but to get the stormwater to a proper catch basin and out from under the road. None of these projects would include any new curb, gutter, or sidewalks.

Chairman Hamilton noted there was more support for Area 4 with secondary support for Area 2. Area 3 received the least support.

CONSENT ITEM 6

Mr. Schuller said the Board had done a lot of work already eliminating one of the four which helped a lot. Area 3 will be the lowest priority.

Boardmember Randall said it sounded like Area 4 needed work so he would characterize that as his first priority. His second priority would be Area 1 and third would be Area 2.

Boardmember Guedel's first priority was Area 2 which was defined as a minor arterial indicating it was the highest traffic area of the four. With the limited dollars available, it was important to get the most benefit for the most number of travelers. His secondary area would be Area 4.

Boardmember Burke would focus on safety for this first year. They were just getting started with the program and it wasn't a full amount of funding so his priorities were Areas 2 and 4.

Boardmember Guzak selected Areas 1, 2 and 4 as her priorities.

Boardmembers Schilaty and Clemans both selected Areas 4, 2 and 1 in order of priority.

Chairman Hamilton's preferences were Areas 4, 2 and 1 also. Area 4 received four votes as the top priority, two votes for second priority and one vote for third. Area 2 was next with three votes as primary and four as secondary. Area 1 got one vote for primary and three as third priority. Area 3 got no votes.

MOTION by Guzak, second by Randall, that the priorities of the Board were Area 4 as #1, Area 2 as #2, and Area 1 as #3. The motion passed unanimously (7-0).

6. DISCUSSION ITEM – TBD Board Annual Report

The draft annual report was provided for Board review, looking at the time frame from the TBD Board formation by the City Council in September 2010 through the expected action of tonight's meeting. This document would be used to provide citizens with a summary of what the Board has done during this time. The report will be posted on the City webpage. Did the Board have any suggestions or recommendations?

Mr. Bauman had a suggestion for the Frequently Asked Questions. Many were framed in the subjunctive case. He would change the "how would" to "how will" now. The FAQ was written for the original newsletter that went out prior to the election.

MOTION by Guzak, second by Clemans, that the TBD Board approve the annual report with the changes of tense from past to future. The motion passed unanimously (7-0).

7. CONSENT ITEM – APPROVE the minutes of the regular meeting of September 6, 2011

MOTION by Burke, second by Schilaty, to approve the Consent Item. The motion passed unanimously (7-0).

8. OTHER BUSINESS/INFORMATION ITEMS

Boardmember Guzak asked about Mr. Davis' comment of the City giving money to Lake Tye.

CONSENT ITEM 6

Mr. Bauman was not aware of any funding being allocated directly by the City. The Economic Development Manager was working collaboratively with other regional ED Managers on the Sky Valley recreational area objectives and he believed Lake Tye was one of those broader regional improvements.

9. **ADJOURN** at 6:40

APPROVED this 7th day of February 2012

CITY OF SNOHOMISH

ATTEST:

Chairman

Torchie Corey, City Clerk