Port of Everett

Proposition 2

Ballot Title

New Port Commissioner Districts

The Commissioners of the Port of Everett adopted Resolution No. 935-A concerning the districts of new port commissioners. In the event that the number of port commissioners of the Port of Everett is increased from three port commissioners to five port commissioners, this proposition would direct that the districts for the two new commissioners include the entire port district. Should this proposition be approved or rejected?

Explanatory Statement

Current Situation: Each of the three Port Commissioners is elected from a separate commissioner district within the entire Port District. In the event that the proposition increasing the number of port commissioners from three commissioners to five commissioners is approved, this proposition, if approved, will direct that the districts for the two newly created commissioner positions include the entire Port District; also referred to as "district-wide" commissioner districts. This will result in having the three current Port Commissioner positions remain to be elected from their respective port districts and the two new port commissioner positions will be elected from the entire Port District.

If the proposition increasing the number of port commissioners from three commissioners to five commissioners is approved, and if this proposition is defeated, the two new port commissioner positions will have separate districts which will be created after the election by redrawing the port commissioner district boundaries from three (3) commissioner districts to five (5) commissioner districts.

Statement For
Statement by: Frank Foster, Peggy Toepel

Currently the Port of Everett boundaries consists of three districts with one commissioner selected from each. If the Commission is expanded to 5 commissioners, then these added two commissioners should be selected on an "at large" basis rather than establishing two new districts.

At-Large District representation is not a new concept. The Port of Edmonds experienced a change with their commission from three members to five; the two new commissioners were elected "at large".

The benefits of two "at large" members are as follows:

1.) There is a larger pool of talent to draw from than is available if the selection area is limited to two new areas lying within the boundaries of the existing Port district.
2.) The Port is involved in creating jobs and economic development which has a significant impact on the entire county. Having two "at large" commissioners enables a voter to have three sources of commissioner contact which would not be available if the two "at large" members were confined to a geographical area.

The formation of two new districts within the Port boundary would require the carving out of portions of existing districts which would then become a political issue for certain groups within the existing districts. Also, the cost of creating new boundaries for five (5) districts is a significant additional expense as well as time-consuming for staff and the commission.

Statement Against
Statement by: Phil Bannan, Don Hopkins, Jeff LaLone

Electing the commissioners from separate districts ensures that all areas of the port district receive equal representation and would avoid the likelihood of one area being over represented by two or more commissioners. Vote no for "district wide" commissioners.

Rebuttal of Statement Against

The required hours from staff and commissioners in creating new boundaries take away from the essential work of the Port Commission.

The two added At-Large commissioners must represent the interests of constituents in all the Port districts, working with your district's current representative, not just the district where they reside. Your opportunity for equal and effective representation improves through access to, and communication with, an At-Large commissioner, in addition to your home-district commissioner.

Rebuttal of Statement For

With "at large" commissioners it is almost a certainty that two or more commissioners will reside in the same area. Different areas within the port district like Mukilteo or South Everett deserve equal representation. Vote no for "at large" commissioners.

Edmonds Transportation Benefit District

Proposition 1

Ballot Title

The Board of Directors of the Edmonds Transportation Benefit District adopted Ordinance No. 2 concerning financing specified transportation improvements by an increase in vehicle fee. This proposition would authorize an additional vehicle fee under RCW 82.80.140 of $40, for a total of $60 per vehicle, in order to fund transportation improvements specifically described and prioritized in the ordinance, which would include walkways, bicycle loop signage, signalization, intersection improvements, lighting, corridor enhancements, and roadway improvements, all as provided in Ordinance No. 2. Should this proposition be approved or rejected?

Explanatory Statement

The Board of the Edmonds Transportation Benefit District has identified thirty-seven (37) transportation improvement projects for funding through a voter authorized increase in the local vehicle fee of Forty Dollars ($40.00) per vehicle. The 37 projects include construction of walkways, pedestrian lighting improvements, intersection improvements, street upgrades, traffic calming programs, and new signal construction and replacement in addition to resurfacing of city streets to preserve their condition and reduce future maintenance costs. The additional revenue guaranteed by the fees is dedicated to these projects and can be used for no other purpose. 99% of the monies generated (the State Department of Licensing takes 1% to administer the program) will be spent on projects to improve Edmonds local transportation system. A detailed list of the improvements, their cost and priorities are contained in TBD Ordinance No. 2 and are available upon request from the Edmonds City Clerk and are posted on the City's web site www.ci.edmonds.wa.us. The vehicle fee will expire when the improvements are constructed, unless sooner terminated by the TBD.