

Study Group Proposal: Housing

1. Identify Issues to be Addressed

- 1 Accommodate existing and growing population by increasing the density of residential development in appropriate areas.
- 2 Provide a variety of housing sizes, types, and price ranges to meet the needs of all segments of the population.
- 3 Preserve and enhance the small town character of Anacortes.

2. Identify Possible Concepts to Address Issues

Issues	Possible Concepts
1 - Accommodate existing and growing population by increasing the density of residential development in appropriate areas.	1.1 - Increase the number of buildable residential lots
	1.2 - Reduce required minimum lot size in each residential zone
	1.3 - Encourage development of R4 residential zones to full density potential
	1.4 - Discourage new single family homes in R4 zones
	1.5 - Make triplexes and fourplexes permitted uses in R3 zone and duplexes a permitted use in R2 zone with appropriate design guidelines
	1.6 - Facilitate development of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU's)
	1.7 - Non-residential areas which are no longer suitable for non-residential uses could be rezoned to permit single family and/or multifamily residential use
	1.8 - Allow development of smaller lots in R1 zones
	1.9 - Consider residential/mixed-use development of the Willette site
	1.10 - Identify appropriate areas for future Urban Growth Boundary extension and possible annexation
2 - Provide a variety of housing sizes, types, and price ranges to meet the needs of all segments of the population	2.1 - Incentivize private-sector construction of affordable single and multi-family housing
	2.2 - Encourage "urban" housing development in the CBD, C, and CM1 zones with appropriate standards for mixed-use projects
	2.3 - Increase support of low/moderate-income housing providers, agencies, and non-profits

Study Group Proposal: Housing

	2.4 - Consider a Housing Levy to provide ongoing funding for affordable housing
	2.5 - Encourage local and regional affiliations and alliances to provide affordable housing
	2.6 - Permit independent/assisted-care residential facilities in R4 and Medical Overlay Zones
	2.7 - Find ways to integrate smaller housing options into existing neighborhoods
	2.8 - Provide or support/encourage additional support services, including transportation options, to allow seniors to remain independent in their own homes
	2.9 - Provide or support/encourage additional support services, including transportation options, to allow people with special needs to live in various neighborhoods in small group homes
	2.10 - Provide housing and services for homeless people
	2.11 - Provide opportunities for live-work housing
3 - Preserve and enhance the small town character of Anacortes.	3.1 - Acknowledge and support existing neighborhood development patterns
	3.2 - Draft and implement Design Standards to facilitate compatibility between existing and new housing
	3.3 - Consider reducing the allowable density and/or restricting the size or number of units per building in R4 areas that are now predominantly single family
	3.4 - Encourage “campus” development which creates multi-family neighborhoods rather than isolated “institutions”
	3.5 - Delete most non-residential uses in residential zones

Study Group Proposal: Housing

3. Perform Evaluation of Concepts

Concepts	Evaluation
<p>1.1 - Increase the number of buildable residential lots</p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could provide lower-priced lots, Increasing the possibility of lower-priced homes • Could result in more new units, both single family and multifamily • Could reduce the pressure to demolish existing structures for redevelopment <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Market forces may result in smaller but higher cost homes <p>Comments</p> <p>Types and price ranges of residential units built will depend on size and location of additional lots.</p>
<p>1.2 - Reduce required minimum lot size in each residential zone</p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows larger lots to be subdivided for sale (or heirs) • Could result in smaller, infill homes • Could allow more units on multifamily site <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cramps single-family neighborhoods • Continues single-family as predominant housing form, limiting development options for multifamily units • Density impacts are more apparent <p>Comments</p> <p>May be difficult to subdivide with existing uses on larger lots</p>

Study Group Proposal: Housing

<p>1.3 - Encourage development of R4 residential zones to full density potential.</p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider revising development standards such as height, parking, lot coverage, etc. in the R4 zones to encourage building more units. • Support the multifamily focus of the zone. • More fully utilize available multifamily sites • Accommodate more population growth. <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More significant changes to older neighborhoods, • Traffic and parking impacts. <p>Comments</p> <p>Developers are constrained from building to higher densities by having to meet some of the current zoning requirements.</p>
<p>1.4 - Discourage new single family homes in R4 zones</p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the potential number of new units • Support the multifamily focus of the zone. <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Property may remain undeveloped • Some lots are too small for multifamily <p>Comments</p> <p>Building single family homes on lots that could have room for more units is counterproductive to the goal of accommodating more residents.</p>
<p>1.5 - Make triplexes and fourplexes permitted uses in R3 zone and duplexes a permitted use in R2 zone with appropriate design guidelines</p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adds rental units • Could provide (rental) income to resident owner • Eliminating requirement for Conditional Use Permit encourages development <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could result in density crowding • May result in larger structures in single-family neighborhood • Difficult guideline development process <p>Comments</p> <p>Larger single-family homes could be renovated to accommodate additional units without negative appearance impact</p>

Study Group Proposal: Housing

<p>1.6 - Facilitate development of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU's)</p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ADU's don't increase "appearance of density" • ADU's offer much-needed, smaller rental possibilities • Cost effective development • Fits character of predominantly single-family neighborhoods <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased traffic/parking impacts in single-family neighborhoods • ADU's need to remain viable upon sale of property <p>Comments</p> <p>Current regulations on parking and owner-residence may be overly restrictive.</p>
<p>1.7 - Non-residential areas which are no longer suitable for non-residential uses could be rezoned to permit single family and/or multifamily residential use</p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increases potential housing sites/units • Clarifies ambiguity in zoning of areas no longer appropriate for original "use" <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May compromise existing uses by adding new residential <p>Comments</p> <p>These areas should be considered on a case-by-case basis with public input. Examples: CM zone along Fidalgo Bay Road, CM zone at Portalis and San Juan Passage, Willette Business Park.</p>

Study Group Proposal: Housing

<p>1.8 - Allow development of smaller lots in R1 zones</p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adds developable lots in area already zoned for residential use • Previous Planned Unit Developments are already built out at R2 density • Complies with GMA density standards for urban areas <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some R1 areas may have habitat corridors to be protected • Increases population pressure adjacent to Forestlands <p>Comments</p> <p>Habitat corridors could be identified and required to be maintained - offer incentives for doing so.</p>
<p>1.9 - Consider residential/mixed-use development of the Willette site</p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Master-planned development could meet a variety of housing needs by including a range of prices, sizes, and unit types • Thoughtful development could include services and neighborhood amenities appropriate to that area • Would not impact existing residential areas • Could provide long-term financial benefits to the City <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic impacts • Difficult vehicular access to town • Steep site is costly to develop • Developers may not want to build what City prefers to have in this area • Would reduce the supply of Light Manufacturing land <p>Comments</p> <p>This is a long term project that could include multiple partners.</p>

Study Group Proposal: Housing

<p>1.10 - Identify appropriate areas for future Urban Growth Area extension and possible annexation</p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expansion contiguous with existing residential areas could satisfy some housing demand • Be prepared to respond in case population growth exceeds projections. <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban sprawl into rural areas • Added costs and complexity of infrastructure extension <p>Comments</p> <p>This should be considered on a case-by-case basis as part of a long range plan.</p>
<p>2.1 - Incentivize private-sector construction of affordable single and multi-family housing</p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regulatory process changes could reduce cost of land and/or development costs • Simplified permitting process could encourage development • Invites private sector to be more a “partner” <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contractors may take benefit and “run” • Need for controls on “affordability” • May reduce incentive possibilities for non-profits • Requires careful structuring and monitoring of projects <p>Comments</p> <p>Involves potential of blurring of the lines in “free-market”. How will City arbitrate?</p>

Study Group Proposal: Housing

<p>2.2 - Encourage “urban” housing development in the CBD, C, and CM1 zones with appropriate standards for mixed-use projects</p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides additional housing in close proximity to shopping/services • Satisfies preference of some residents for small-unit housing in-town • Facilitates walkable and vibrant downtown <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There may be a limited market for urban living • Impact on parking availability • If on-site parking is required of development, costs could be prohibitive <p>Comments</p> <p>National and regional trends indicate a substantial market for this type of housing, which is under-served in Anacortes.</p>
<p>2.3 - Increase support of low/moderate-income housing providers, agencies, and non-profits</p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-profits are best situated to use support to assure long-term affordability. • Provides support to often under-funded providers <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some segments of the population will still be unable to afford housing rental or purchase • How to demonstrate fairness with choice of recipients <p>Comments</p> <p>Can assure long-term affordability via deed restrictions, 50 year tax credit programs, or other requirements.</p>

Study Group Proposal: Housing

<p>2.4 - Consider a Housing Levy to provide ongoing funding for affordable housing</p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides stable and sustainable funding source • Levy defines specifics of support and process • Could be a minimal impact with significant return to the community <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It could be seen negatively as “tax increase” • Requires management and staffing <p>Comments</p> <p>Other municipalities have passed this form of support.</p>
<p>2.5 - Encourage local and regional affiliations and alliances to provide affordable housing</p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leveraging partnerships can improve funding opportunities • Cooperative effort creates synergy of resource allocation <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May be seen as additional government intrusion • Mechanics of allocation may be complicated <p>Comments</p> <p>HOME Consortium could deliver significant funding support</p>

Study Group Proposal: Housing

<p>2.6 - Permit independent and assisted-care residential facilities in all R4 zones</p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locates population likely needing increased access to healthcare facilities in closer proximity to those services • “Independent” facilities within walking distance of CBD, services • Removes uncertainty of Conditional Use process in residential zones • May reduce need for van/bus transport <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutionalization of area • Displacement of single-family housing within walkable distance of CBD/services <p>Comments</p> <p>Assisted living facilities are simply a variation of multifamily residences, with the provision of some on-site services - thus they are appropriately located among other multifamily units.</p>
<p>2.7 - Find ways to integrate smaller housing options into existing neighborhoods</p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enables seniors to downsize, while remaining in a familiar neighborhood • Adds to diversity of neighborhoods <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some neighborhoods already fully developed with larger homes • May continue isolation of seniors from CBD/services <p>Comments</p> <p>Variety of housing sizes and types is one of the attractions of Old Town, but that diversity is unavailable in more recent suburban-style developments.</p>

Study Group Proposal: Housing

<p>2.8 - Provide or support/encourage additional support services, including transportation options, to allow seniors to remain independent in their own homes</p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows aging-in-place for independent seniors • Improves access from home to services, pool, shopping, etc. • Reduces senior vehicles on roadways <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adds costs to service providers • Requires added SKAT or other van/bus service <p>Comments</p> <p>Biggest issue is availability of convenient and frequent public transportation options.</p>
<p>2.9 - Provide or support/encourage additional support services, including transportation options, to allow people with special needs to live in various neighborhoods in small group homes</p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrates smaller, special-needs housing into residential neighborhoods (not isolated) • Does not institutionalize residential neighborhood • Integrates people into the community <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential for negative (NIMBY) neighbor reaction • May continue isolation of people from CBD/services if transportation is not available <p>Comments</p> <p>Depends on availability of convenient and frequent public transportation options.</p>

Study Group Proposal: Housing

<p>2.10 - Provide housing and services for homeless people</p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keeps people out of unsafe, unhealthful situations such as living in a car or in the woods Assists people to find solutions to housing, jobs, health Potential for people to become productive permanent residents <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential for negative (NIMBY) neighbor reaction Difficulty of finding a suitable site Difficulty of funding <p>Comments</p> <p>Depends on availability of convenient and frequent public transportation options.</p>
<p>2.11 - Provide opportunities for live-work housing</p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could encourage start-up businesses Reduces necessity to commute to work <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not suitable for all parts of town Need controls on types of businesses with noise, dust, and other impacts <p>Comments</p> <p>Consider the area south of the Industrial zone between 34th and SR20 (currently R3) for this type of mixed-use development.</p>
<p>3.1 - Acknowledge and support existing neighborhood development patterns</p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports strong community preference for maintaining city's "small town character" Reduces uncertainty that the quality of life people enjoy will be diminished Stabilizes real estate values Preserves existing stock of moderately-priced (older) homes <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduces options for increased density <p>Comments</p> <p>Nearly all of the R4 zone, and much of the R4B zone is occupied by modest single family homes, and that character will significantly change if multifamily development replaces those homes.</p>

Study Group Proposal: Housing

<p>3.2 - Draft and implement Design Standards to facilitate compatibility between existing and new housing</p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could mitigate negative impacts of increased density • Could result in improved aesthetics • Could result in increased property value <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficult process to draft “standards” responsive to character of different neighborhoods • May add design/construction costs, making development less affordable <p>Comments</p> <p>With “maintaining the small-town character” being such an important aspect of the community vision this could be a means of achieving that goal.</p>
<p>3.3 - Consider reducing the allowable density and/or restricting the size or number of units per building in R4 areas that are now predominantly single family</p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows some multifamily development in single-family-dominant neighborhoods by requiring compatible scale • Larger complex could be built as multiple smaller buildings • Maintains “small-town character” <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May act to limit some multifamily development in higher density neighborhoods • Does not guarantee no gentrification will occur <p>Comments</p> <p>Finding a balance between (larger) multifamily developments and existing smaller single family homes will be a challenge</p>

Study Group Proposal: Housing

<p>3.4 - Encourage “campus” development which creates multi-family neighborhoods rather than isolated “institutions”</p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creates intentional interconnectedness between buildings and services • Improves “quality of life” for residents • More appealing site development may result in fewer vacancies and improved financial sustainability • Could include neighborhood amenities such as a deli or coffee shop or small park <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could make development more complicated • May increase development costs <p>Comments</p> <p>Thoughtful site planning and design improves appeal to both residents and the community</p>
<p>3.5 - Delete most non-residential uses in residential zones</p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthens the residential focus of these zones. • Reduces conflicts between incompatible uses. • Stabilizes prices of residential land. <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduces opportunities for commercial uses outside the commercial zones. <p>Comments</p> <p>Nonresidential uses (particularly medical and commercial) can often afford to pay more for land, thus out-bidding residential builders and reducing the supply of multifamily residential land. Suggest deleting hospital and clinic as permitted uses in R4 and R4B, but retaining them in R4A. Also deleting small manufacturing uses in R4B.</p>

4. Defining Preferred Plan Proposal

<p>Preferred Plan for Issue 1 (Describe proposed preferred plan for Issue.)</p>
<p>Preferred Plan for Issue 2 (Describe proposed preferred plan for Issue.)</p>

Study Group Proposal: Housing

Preferred Plan Issue 3
(Describe proposed preferred plan for Issue.)

5. Proposed Changes to Comprehensive Plan Language

Preferred Plan for Issue 1	
Potential Conflict in Current Comp Plan Language	Proposed Comp Plan Language
•	•
Preferred Plan for Issue 2	
Potential Conflict in Current Comp Plan Language	Proposed Comp Plan Language
•	•
Preferred Plan for Issue 3	
Potential Conflict in Current Comp Plan Language	Proposed Comp Plan Language
•	•

Study Group Proposal: Transportation

1. Identify Issues to be Addressed

- 1 Traffic congestion/safety on SR 20/SR 20 Spur
- 2 Intra and inter-city public transportation services
- 3 Non-motorized transportation improvements/safety
- 4 Limited and/or inconvenient CBD and Commercial Avenue parking

2. Identify Possible Concepts to Address Issues

Issues	Possible Concepts
1 - Traffic congestion/safety on SR 20/SR 20 Spur <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharpes Corner intersection • Ferry traffic on Oakes Avenue 	1.1 - Consider forming SR20/SR20 Spur Citizen’s Committee to directly engage legislature and WSDOT on known improvements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharpes Corner Interchange • Ferry Terminal Upgrade
	1.2 – Extend left turn lane (Whidbey) at Sharpes Corner for westbound SR 20 traffic
	1.3 – Eliminate or make exit only the dangerous intersection at SR 20 Spur and Fidalgo Bay Road – both east and west side
	1.4 - Trigger a passenger “alert” system whenever congestion at ferry terminal exceeds a pre-determined threshold: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide suggested alternate routes • Send text messages to passengers with reservations and/or pre-subscribed with WSDOT • Electronic messaging boards entering city
	1.5 – Add a dedicated lane for ferry traffic extending eastward on Oakes Avenue
	1.6 – Provide adequate shoulders, safe bicycle lanes, sidewalks, and street lighting from Commercial Avenue to the Ferry Terminal
	1.7 – Complete W.2 nd Street between Baltimore and Erie Avenue to provide alternate route for local and emergency traffic
	1.8 – Enhance traffic safety/enforcement during times of heavy ferry traffic
	1.9 – Commission a feasibility study to determine optimum truck route for ferry bound trucks.

Study Group Proposal: Transportation

Issues	Possible Concepts
<p>2 – Intra and inter-city public transportation services</p>	<p>2.1 – Add intra city public transit service that connects neighborhoods with key city services/businesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Skyline, Old Town, Central, South • CBD, Ferries, Airport, Hospital, Pool, Sr. Center, AHS, Marinas, Parks, Industrial
	<p>2.2 – Consider a seasonal local “trolley” service for CBD/Commercial Ave/Marinas/Depot</p>
	<p>2.3 – Expand direct SKAT services to Skagit Valley College, Skagit Valley Hospital, and Cascade Mall.</p>
	<p>2.4 – Ensure public transportation options are available for water and air travelers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air shuttles to Bellingham and Seattle • Water taxis to islands
<p>3 - Non-motorized transportation improvements/safety</p>	<p>3.1 – Complete the Guemes Channel Trail to connect with the Tommy Thompson Trail via the CBD.</p>
	<p>3.2 – Implement “high value” bicycle corridor improvements as identified in the <i>Anacortes Bikes and Walks of 2012</i>.</p>
	<p>3.3 – Incorporate key street and walkway design concepts outlined in the <i>Anacortes Walkability and Livability Workshop report of 2006</i>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate pedestrian and bicycle accommodations into all new construction • Use “bump outs” and caution/warning signs to mark pedestrian crossings • Eliminate unused/unnecessary driveway “cutouts” along city streets
	<p>3.4 – Develop a Bicycle/Pedestrian Master Plan</p>
	<p>3.5 – Install public electric car charging stations</p>
<p>4 - Limited and/or inconvenient CBD and Commercial Avenue parking</p>	<p>4.1 – Optimize on-street parking configurations</p>
	<p>4.2 – Consider parking meters</p>
	<p>4.3 – Consider a city parking lot or garage</p>

Study Group Proposal: Transportation

3. Perform Evaluation of Concepts

Concepts	Evaluation
<p>1.1 - Consider forming SR20/SR20 Spur Citizen’s Committee to directly engage legislature and WSDOT on known improvements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharpes Corner Interchange • Ferry Terminal Upgrade 	<p>Benefits – An SR20/SR20 Spur Citizen’s Committee that regularly engages our state representatives and the legislature may help to expedite completion of these critical projects.</p> <p>Risks – May not help as there are more critical projects per WSDOT.</p> <p>Comments – These projects have been engineered but funding has been cancelled/deferred for almost 10 years by the legislature!</p>
<p>1.2 – Convert the westbound left lane of SR20 at Sharpes Corner into a dedicated left turn lane to Whidbey Island.</p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve safety of this very congested intersection by reducing the potential for accidents due to traffic backups into a through left lane. <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would reduce the westbound through lanes to Anacortes from two to one near the Sharpes Corner intersection • There would be additional traffic control signage needed. <p>Comments – With the additional EF-18 squadrons coming to NAS Whidbey and general growth, this problem will only get worse!</p>
<p>1.3 – Eliminate or make exit only the dangerous intersection at SR 20 Spur and Fidalgo Bay Road – both east and west side</p>	<p>Benefits – This would potentially save lives and/or prevent serious injuries.</p> <p>Risks – Will create an inconvenience for local residents that regularly use the intersection.</p> <p>Comments – A bridge spanning across SR20 has been proposed in the past as a possible solution. Issue would be cost/benefit.</p>
<p>1.4 - Trigger a passenger “alert” system whenever congestion at ferry terminal exceeds a pre-determined threshold:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide suggested alternate routes • Send text messages to passengers with reservations and/or pre-subscribed with WSDOT • Electronic messaging boards entering city 	<p>Benefits – This could reduce or eliminate congestion near the San Juan Island Ferry Terminal providing passengers, local residents, and emergency vehicles with a better and safer experience.</p> <p>Risks – Development, construction, and passenger education costs to make the system effective.</p> <p>Comments – The new ferry reservation system beginning in 2015 may eliminate or reduce the need for such a system.</p>

Study Group Proposal: Transportation

Concepts	Evaluation
<p>1.5 – Add a dedicated lane for ferry traffic extending eastward on Oakes Avenue</p>	<p>Benefits – Could eliminate congestion due to westbound ferry traffic backing up onto Oakes Avenue preventing local traffic from passing. Local traffic, walk-on pick-up and drop-off, public transit, and emergency vehicles would not be delayed.</p> <p>Risks – Costs to construct the dedicated holding lane.</p> <p>Comments - The new ferry reservation system beginning in 2015 may reduce the need for the holding lane.</p>
<p>1.6 – Provide adequate shoulders, safe bicycle lanes, sidewalks, and street lighting from Commercial Avenue to the Ferry Terminal</p>	<p>Benefits – Would provide a convenient and safe path for pedestrians and bicyclists to travel to/from the Ferry Terminal and downtown Anacortes. More pedestrians and bicyclists would use Oakes Avenue to the ferry thereby reducing auto congestion.</p> <p>Risks – Costs for the construction.</p> <p>Comments – Completion of the proposed Guemes Channel Trail would provide an alternative but the need is now.</p>
<p>1.7 – Complete W. 2nd Street between Baltimore and Erie Avenue</p>	<p>Benefits – Would provide an alternate route for local and emergency vehicle traffic during periods of Oakes congestion.</p> <p>Risks – Costs for construction.</p> <p>Comments – Only a partial solution to the congestion problem on Oakes.</p>
<p>1.8 – Enhance traffic safety/enforcement during times of heavy ferry traffic</p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discourage motorists from taking unnecessary risks and improve overall safety <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costs for additional law enforcement
<p>1.9 – Commission a feasibility study to determine optimum truck route for ferry bound trucks</p> <p>There is currently no prescribed route for heavy trucks traveling north on R Avenue to get onto 12th/Oakes Avenue westward to the ferry terminal. This situation forces truckers to use routes that may not be optimum for a number of reasons, including safety, road integrity, etc.</p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gain a complete understanding of all the issues with the pros and cons of various alternatives • Lead to a long-term solution <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost for the study <p>Comments</p>

Study Group Proposal: Transportation

Concepts	Evaluation
<p>2.1 – Add intra city public transit service that connects neighborhoods with key city services/businesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Skyline, Old Town, Central, South • CBD, Ferries, Airport, Hospital, Pool, Sr. Center, AHS, Marinas, Parks, Industrial <p>In order for such a service to be supported by the public, it MUST serve all neighborhoods, make frequent stops, serve all key business and services, and provide reliable regular service.</p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides citizens with an alternative to driving their automobile into town thereby reducing toxic emissions and greenhouse gases. • For citizens who do not or cannot drive, it would provide them with greater freedom of movement and make them less dependent on others. <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there enough demand to support the service? • Who would operate? • An analysis performed by a city staff intern determined that the annual operating cost would be \$340K. <p>Comments – A detailed needs/demand analysis is needed.</p>
<p>2.2 – Consider a seasonal local “trolley” service for CBD/Commercial Ave/Marina/Depot</p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would reduce the need for local automobile trips thereby reducing the toxic emissions and greenhouse gases. • Could be a great way to promote tourism by providing visitors with a convenient way to get around town. <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demand for the service • Operational costs <p>Comments</p>
<p>2.3 – Expand direct SKAT services to Skagit Valley College, Skagit Valley Hospital, and Cascade Mall.</p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for people wanting to further their education, e.g. Running Start • Convenient access for seniors that need to see doctors at Skagit Valley Hospital • Convenient access to the many retail stores in Burlington <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demand for the service • Operational costs <p>Comments</p>

Study Group Proposal: Transportation

Concepts	Evaluation
<p>2.4 – Ensure public transportation options are available for water and air travelers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air shuttles to Bellingham and Seattle • Water taxis to islands 	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connectivity from the Anacortes airport to the local regional airports is very important to a segment of our businesses and citizens • Water taxi and freight service to the islands is important to our local economy <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negative impacts to the local economy <p>Comments</p>
Concepts	Evaluation
<p>3.1 – Complete the Guemes Channel Trail to connect with the Tommy Thompson Trail via the CBD.</p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A wonderful asset to enhance the livability of the city • An alternative pedestrian and bicycle friendly pathway from the CBD/Commercial Avenue to the San Juan Ferry Terminal. <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion of the Trail that would connect to the CBD is NOT guaranteed. It may be many years or never. • Funding for construction <p>Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to its utilitarian value, the Trail would be have recreational and health benefits as well.
<p>3.2 – Implement “high value” bicycle corridor improvements as identified in the <i>Anacortes Bikes and Walks of 2012</i>.</p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Making the city more bicycle and pedestrian friendly will encourage more walkers and riders. • Better health • Reduced toxic and greenhouse gas emissions <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding for the recommended improvements <p>Comments</p>

Study Group Proposal: Transportation

<p>3.3 – Incorporate key street and walkway design concepts outlined in the <i>Anacortes Walkability and Livability Workshop report of 2006</i>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate pedestrian and bicycle accommodations into all new construction • Use “bump outs” and caution signs to mark pedestrian crossings • Eliminate unused/unnecessary driveway “cutouts” along streets 	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make the city a more walk and bicycle friendly city • Fewer pedestrian/bicycle – auto accidents • Enhances the livability/quality of life of the city <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costs/funding for improvements <p>Comments</p>
<p>3.4 – Develop a Bicycle/Pedestrian Master Plan</p> <p>The League of American Bicyclists strongly recommends that cities develop a Master Plan to guide their progress towards being a bike friendly city.</p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides guidance to those involved with city planning and construction • A vehicle for citizen engagement <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to meet citizen expectations and commitments <p>Comments</p>
<p>3.5 – Install public electric car charging stations</p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage the public to use a low emission form of transportation <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costs for the charging stations
<p>Concepts</p>	<p>Evaluation</p>
<p>4.1 – Optimize on-street parking configurations</p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modest gains but low cost <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public reaction <p>Comments</p>
<p>4.2 – Consider parking meters</p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More efficient use of scarce spaces • New revenue stream for the city <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negative public reaction • Costs for implementation/enforcement <p>Comments – Anacortes residents may feel they have a birth right to free public parking?</p>
<p>4.3 – Build a city parking lot or garage</p>	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More efficient use of scarce spaces • Potential new revenue stream for the city <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expensive to build • Ongoing security/maintenance • Negative public reaction • May require associated public transportation <p>Comments</p>

Study Group Proposal: Transportation

4. Define Preferred Plan Proposal

Preferred Plan for Issue 1 (Describe proposed preferred plan for Issue.)
Preferred Plan for Issue 2 (Describe proposed preferred plan for Issue.)
Preferred Plan Issue 3 (Describe proposed preferred plan for Issue.)

5. Proposed Changes to Comprehensive Plan Language

Preferred Plan for Issue 1	
Potential Conflict in Current Comp Plan Language	Proposed Comp Plan Language
•	•
Preferred Plan for Issue 2	
Potential Conflict in Current Comp Plan Language	Proposed Comp Plan Language
•	•
Preferred Plan for Issue 3	
Potential Conflict in Current Comp Plan Language	Proposed Comp Plan Language
•	•