

## **EASTSOUND PLANNING REVIEW COMMITTEE AGENDA**

### **SPECIAL MEETING**

**JUNE 25, 2020**

**3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.**

**Committee met with social distancing measures at Templin Center**

**Public access by Zoom**

---

#### **3:14 pm Welcome and Introductions**

There are 24 members present by Zoom. Leith introduced Colin Huntmer, San Juan County Engineer – thanking him for presenting with short notice. Leith also welcomed the public and shared the EPRC’s desire to hear from them during Public Comment, also encouraging the public to email her at leithtemplin@hotmail.com with additional feedback.

#### **Opening discussion of Prune Alley Project with Colin Huntmer**

Colin presented some background on past improvements to Eastsound, see attached. Discussion included strategic selection and placement of lighting with public safety and light pollution as top considerations, as well as avoiding an urbanizing aesthetic in Eastsound.

Charles Toxey presented a slideshow with a variety of lighting options to consider – see attached.

#### **4:00 pm Public Comments by Zoom**

Dan Christopherson

- Thanks Colin, Rick and Leith for their work with the EPRC on this project. Spoke to some of the comments he’s read on Orcas Issues, adding that he feels the business owners in town are the major stakeholders, followed by other residents, then tourists. He shared he feels the security benefits of added lighting to Eastsound has been discounted by many. He further shared that there have been scholarly studies done by universities and others that support lighting options that increase security, concluding his comment by sharing that towns have necessary public safety lighting needs.

Keara Axelrod

- Addressed one of Dan’s previous comments, sharing that she does not feel it is the responsibility of Eastsound to pay for the security of private businesses. Sharing also that its unclear what problems are to be solved. One being safety for pedestrians to be able to see while crossing the street and the other is motorists ability to see pedestrians. She feels that overhead lighting is not a great way to light crosswalks for motorists to be able to see pedestrians, and also shared the desire to know that there was indeed an actual issue and not just looking for ways to spend money. questioning why overhead lighting was the only type that seemed to be considered. She recommended using lit pavers and adding new crosswalks and questioned why there was a space concern with bollards but not with overhead lighting as it seems the footprint would be the same. In conclusion she asked the EPRC to clarify if those were indeed the problems needing resolve.

Tara Anderson

- Tara introduced herself as an owner of the Barnacle Tea and Sprits on Prune Alley, and thanked Colin and Rick for taking into consideration the rural nature of Eastsound, the sensitivity to night sky and the need to have an attractive end product that provides for safety. She shared concern about the dangers on Prune Alley, especially in the winter when it gets dark earlier – with children walking from school and the library and pedestrians on foot. Tara shared her support of safety lighting that is adjustable to suit the desires of Eastsound aesthetics.

Chris Rodgers

- Chris represents the property owner of the vacant lot just north of the open space on Prune Alley. There are concerns for the pole-type lighting fixtures that will cast light into the adjoining properties and encourages consideration of lighting options that do not flood into adjoining properties – sharing further that he is not opposed to lighting in general. Leith sought clarification that the property adjoins the Fern street park. Chris confirmed.

Millie V.

- Felt it would have been helpful if the presentation could have included the lighting that is currently in Friday Harbor, sharing further that her preference is a combination of options 3 and 5 – of like design at different scale. While Millie is appreciative of the safety issues she feels it is equally important to consider the overall aesthetic of the design and integration with design of benches, waste receptacles, and so forth. The other question she had was in regards to the lighting at the Eastsound Firestation and whether that would still be considered.

Tim Blanchard

- Shared concern about the proposal to jump to overhead lighting without trying a bollard approach first, citing it was an urbanizing step for Eastsound and feels we should protect rural character as much as we can. Further, the comprehensive plan indicates we should only be expanding on the basis of demonstrated local need, and if that need is identifying better where the crosswalks are, that it seems we can handle that with bollard lighting. Worse, is the threat of speedbumps or flashing signs of any kind, which would be far more urbanizing than any overhead light. Among the overhead lighting samples, he prefers 3 and 5, which introduces the least change in style – sharing further that option 4 seems to be stylized and option 1 has an urbanized feel. In conclusion he stressed he felt we should consider bollard lighting first, then option 3, and work to protect rural character with additional consideration to the cost of maintenance.

Marc Cohen

- Feels aesthetic is the overriding consideration, and safety is also important. Marc feels that the thought of speedbumps being incompatible with the rural character of our town is misguided, sharing that speedbumps are placed where traffic needs to slow down. Lighting for pedestrians can be achieved by lighted pavers across the road, further sharing that he does not a convincing case has been made to place bollard or pole lighting in Eastsound and would like the other possibilities explored first.

Chris (unknown last)

- Shared there were several comments regarding ‘no lighting’ in response to a letter she submitted to Orcas Issues. In looking at what Marc mentioned, she would like lighted pavers and raised crosswalks. She also inquired what does the budget for lighting look like, who pays for it and who has the final say on what will be approved or denied.

**Public Comments, continued- copied directly from the chat feature on Zoom and submitted to the Zoom group chat via PDF as well as Leith Templin by email:**

Sadie B

- is this our last chance to submit comment
- Please advise Council to postpone any final decisions on this road plan until we can have proper public discourse and input that was promised to us
- The lighting plan needs to be scrapped if Templins Center/Island Market is any indicator of how much more light pollution we are being asked to bear. There are SO MANY violations to this lighting plan already in existence. If those are not addressed, we are only going to exacerbate the glaring light pollution problem in Eastsound and surround.
- 
- How much parking will be lost with the new Plan? Please describe the overhead streetlights - height, lumens, warm or cool, etc. It is already very well lit at these intersections. we do not need these overhead lights. They are overkill.
- 
- 16' high seems way too much overkill! too much light. way too much light and too overbearing of a presence.
- Question: which fixtures are LEAST vulnerable to vandalism? Because we have home depot style fixtures at Lav. Hollow and kids vandalize them a lot - the bulbs. they break them.
- Agree with Chris Rogers recommendation for lit pavers
- Why put them up if they are gonna be terrible. Are we married to overhead lighting? Please seriously discuss and research Kiara Axelrod's suggestion of lit pavers at crosswalks. I walk in town at night a lot - it's pretty well lit! Just light the darkest parts - which will be ever-changing as more development happens.
- I'm good with streetlights IF and only IF we remove all lights and redo all lights that don't fit the low BUG standards. Please address the violations and remedy them. Why spend money this recklessly if we are just going to maybe tear them down or have to redo them? This is not good management of our budget and resources.
- thanks. and So far I agree 100% with Tim, Keara, and Chris, and Marc - if we can find compromises for lighting that address these issues then I think the public would be more supportive. My other questions are about parking, and also if street paint would work?
- the kind of paint that shows up in the dark?
- there is street paint that is reflective. Can't we mark some crossing places with that?

Eleanor Hoague

- are 6 yellow dots the lights that are proposed?
- Are we really at a point where we can only input our opinions about the TYPE of lighting, and not WHETHER there will be any lighting at all?
-

Chris Rodgers

- I don't believe overhead lighting is a good fit for the character of Eastsound. Enhancing pedestrian safety from cars is a worthy goal — so again, I would look at lit pavers that clearly mark ped crossings for drivers
- Has the color of the light fixture been selected? Gray, white or black?

Millie V

- I believe at one time it was said that the lighting would be identical to that at the Eastbound Fire Station. Please comment on this. Also, why are the streets visually of towns much larger than ours? No good comparisons

Keara Axelrod

- Why would bollards take up more space than overhead lights?
- If we're talking about adding pavers to the crosswalk, have we considered luminous pavers? It would provide a way to clearly see the crosswalk with an absolute minimum of light pollution.
- But it sounds like the problem we're trying to solve is that vehicle traffic isn't slowing/stopping for pedestrians at crosswalks?
- Also: It looks from the drawing that the lights are suggested for intersections where there are already stop signs--no?
- I guess that we're looking at defining pedestrian crosswalks a couple of places that don't currently have stop signs on Prune Alley... across from A street and Fern street
- Thanks, Keith
- If we're concerned about drivers--overhead street lights aren't really a sign of a crosswalk
- 
- Having this meeting and associated opportunity for public input during business hours is very exclusive of anyone who has to work for a living; I urge the committee to make the voting period (which I think I heard Rick suggest) open for at least 24 hours so there is more opportunity for public input.
- There is not public confidence that written public comment is taken into consideration.
- 
- There are assumptions being made:
  - - If there are marked crosswalks, pedestrians will not wander into the street at other points
  - - Overhead lights will make motorists slow down
  - - Business owners whose businesses would benefit from lighting (or, apparently, sidewalks) they don't have to pay for seem to have extra weight in this conversation

Vicki Leimback

- Baffle could be optional for each individual property owner affected.

- No speed bumps! Not good for emergency response. Noise and pollution from acceleration
- We need lighting for safety and security
- We don't want to run over pedestrians at night. Even at 20 mph, it's a scary hazard!
- Eastsound is a town!

Chris Rogers

- Are there design guidelines you will be using to select a fixture — the examples you are showing represent a broad stylistic range
- I agree with the recommendation to consider lit pavers in the street at the crossing locations. Perhaps they are motion activated? Any of the tall fixtures will likely be intrusive to adjoining properties
- A light fixture that is 12 - 16' high will cast light on adjoining properties. If the goal is to light the crossings, let's focus there (no pun intended)
- Has the decision been made to go to a pole-like fixture? I think it would be worthwhile to seriously consider the pros/cons of different lighting strategies, such as lit crosswalk pavers, low pavers, in addition to poles (16' is nearly as tall as a 2-story building)
- I meant to type bollards instead of low pavers

Ken Arora

- I think I missed the earlier part of the discussion. Is the lighting to make automobiles more aware of pedestrians, or to provide lighting for the pedestrians themselves? If the former, then lit pavers make sense
- Also, they don't have to motion activated; other places have a button that pedestrians use to cause them to light up
- As the person who mentioned the bollards, I should mention that there are a variety of heights available
- Is there also a summary chart about the light "leakage" for the different options?
- Is it possible to advance to slide 10/Option 5, as it the lowest profile choice?

Marc Cohen

- lit pavers at most. but what about the more basic question: whether there should be ANY lighting?
- and speed bumps to slow the traffic.

EF Fuscher

- I find the fact that they are also modern vs primitive invasive as well they cannot fit within the character of eastsound
- not a good fit at all

Tony Ghazel

- Where is the county getting the funds to pay for the project. That wasn't answered

**4:47 pm Committee resumes discussion with Colin and addresses Public Comment**

Colin spoke to questions received during public comment regarding the footprint of bollard vs. pole lighting, sharing that the footprint would be the same and the overhead lighting was being considered for intersections whereas the bollard lighting would be linearly along the sidewalks. He clarified further that there is some real estate available where the sidewalk bumps out at crosswalk areas providing a small amount of space for either bollard or pole lighting.

The current estimate for the project, while difficult to assess amidst COVID-19, is about \$4-million. Ultimately, this an advisory board decision that will then head to the Council.

The EPRC members shared their opinions surrounding lighting options, consistent sidewalk aesthetic throughout Eastsound, and the desire to include the public in the selection process by way of online and in-person survey. The meeting concluded with ideas on implementation of an on-foot town hall meeting and ways to navigate that during the restricted social-distancing phases during the COVID-19 Pandemic.

**5:50 pm Adjourn**

**NEXT MEETING –July 2, 2020.**

Meeting minutes submitted by Kimberley M. Kimple