

**APPROVED FEBRUARY 24<sup>th</sup>**

**CITY OF EDMONDS  
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

**February 10, 2010**

---

---

Chair Pro Tem Guenther called the meeting of the Edmonds Planning Board to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers, Public Safety Complex, 250 – 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue North.

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT**

Cary Guenther (Chair Pro Tem)  
Kevin Clarke  
John Reed  
Valerie Stewart  
Todd Cloutier  
Kristiana Johnson

**STAFF PRESENT**

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager  
Brian McIntosh, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director  
Ranee McRae, Recreational Manager  
Karin Noyes, Recorder

**BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT**

Michael Bowman, Chair (excused)  
Philip Lovell, Vice Chair (excused)

**READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**BOARD MEMBER REED MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 27, 2010 BE APPROVED AS AMENDED. CHAIR PRO TEM GUENTHER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA**

No changes were made to the agenda.

**AUDIENCE COMMENTS**

No one in the audience expressed a desire to address the Board during this portion of the meeting.

**PUBLIC HEARING ON EDMONDS PLANNING BOARD'S PROCESS AND NAMING RECOMMENDATION FOR THE NEW PARK CURRENTLY UNDER CONSTRUCTION AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF 162<sup>ND</sup> STREET SOUTHWEST AND 75<sup>TH</sup> PLACE WEST IN EDMONDS**

Mr. McIntosh recalled that on December 9, 2009, the Planning Board agreed that the Park Naming Committee would recommend their top choices to the Planning Board in a public hearing at a subsequent Planning Board Meeting. He explained that through the Park Naming Policy adopted by the City Council on March 24, 2009, the Planning Board is charged with recommending park names for new parks developed in Edmonds. A new park will be opened in north Edmonds this spring at the northwest corner of 162<sup>nd</sup> Street Southwest and 75<sup>th</sup> Place West. With the assistance of Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Staff, naming proposals were solicited throughout the City and 63 recommendations (35 actual different names) were submitted for consideration by the Planning Board. A subcommittee was established to examine all the submissions and provide the Planning Board with a short list at the February 20<sup>th</sup> public hearing. The name recommended will be forwarded to the City Council for final approval.

Chair Pro Tem Guenther opened the hearing for public comment.

**John Quast, Edmonds,** said that he lives in the Meadowdale area and was present to speak in favor of naming the new park after Delmar H. Caryl. He explained that Mr. Caryl was involved in local politics and was passionate about the community. He was a librarian at Edmonds Community College and actually wrote a book, *With Angels to the Rear*, which is a history of the Meadowdale area. Mr. Caryl was also an entrepreneur and fisherman in the local area. He was an airplane pilot and spent a lot of time sharing his insight about the history of the area with his neighbors.

**Herb Haines, Seattle,** said he was present to speak in support of naming the new park after his grandfather, Herbert Haines, who owned and operated Haines Wharf from the early 1930's through 1970. He pointed out that his family has a significant presence in the area and his father and uncle owned and operated the park for a number of years, as well. He said he grew up in the Meadowdale school system and many of his teachers worked at the Wharf at one time or another. He said his grandparents, parents, aunts, uncles and cousins lived within a half mile of the wharf. He summarized that not only was Haines Wharf an economic asset to the community, it was also a social place.

**Bob Burton, Edmonds,** said he worked at Haines Wharf in 1950 and 1951 when it was considered the red carpet place to work and fish during the days when people did not have boat trailers and large motors. They came to Haines Wharf and other establishments on Puget Sound to rent 16-foot boats for fishing. He recommended the new park be named Haines Wharf or some variation. He said Haines Wharf was Meadowdale for many years; it offered employment opportunities and thousands of people came to fish. He recalled a time when cars were lined up at the gate at 3 a.m. all the way to Meadowdale Road. He said one neighbor shared how people used to steal his newspaper to read while they were waiting in line.

**Charles LeWarne, Edmonds,** said he came to Edmonds 50 years ago. He pointed out that people have known the location of Haines Wharf for decades. You didn't have to work there or be a fisherman to know about Haines Wharf, and it has been an Edmonds landmark since 1950. He noted that the proposed new park is located right at the wharf so Haines Wharf Park would be an appropriate name. He explained that many people in Edmonds have talked about how to instill a sense of history and heritage in the community. When he served on the Edmonds Historic Preservation Commission, they talked about how to make people aware of the community and what it has been in the past. One of the easiest and least expensive ways to do this is to name things for historic individuals and places that people know. There can be no better example of this than Haines Wharf. People 50 to 100 years from now will want to know what Haines Wharf was and the answer will come that it was an important sport fishing location and a landmark in Edmonds. He asked the Board to recommend naming the new park Haines Wharf or an appropriate variation.

**Janice Haines, Seattle,** said it has been her privilege to marry into the Haines family 15 years ago. When she first became involved with the Haines family she did not realize the magnitude of Haines Wharf and all the history that went along with it. However, throughout the past years, she has learned more and more fascinating things about the wharf. She said that when her husband's father (Herbert Foster Haines) passed away in 2008, many people from the Edmonds area attended the service and reminisced about Haines Wharf. In addition, her husband is an avid fisherman, and he meets a lot of people who want to know if he is connected to the Haines Wharf family. She expressed her belief that it is very important, especially in today's world where history is going by the way side, to save and preserve the memories and greatness of the area. She asked that the Board recommend naming the park Haines Wharf in reference to the Haines family. She said it warms the Haines family's heart to hear that others in the community feel as strongly as they do about the history of the wharf.

**Lori Dressler, Edmonds,** agreed that Haines Wharf has been a huge landmark in the Meadowdale area. However, the history of Meadowdale is much larger than just the wharf. She referred to the history book, *With Angels to the Rear*, written by Delmar Caryl, who was a resident of Meadowdale for more than 70 years. In his book he speaks about Haines Wharf, but he also speaks about so much more that was the Meadowdale area and what it provided for the community and the area economically, culturally, socially, etc. She summarized that Mr. Caryl was a wonderful neighbor and long-term resident. There are many people in the community that deserve to have the park named after them, but she feels the best name for the park is Del Caryl Park.

**Fred Holly, Edmonds,** said his wife's parents moved to the store front across the street in 1952, when it was originally the Meadowdale Post Office and store. He said that in the late 1980's his family purchased the property, including the park

property with the thought of subdividing and selling it. They were able to subdivide and sell a portion of the property they purchased. However, because of the 20,000 square foot lot size requirement, the City informed them that they would not be able to subdivide the remaining property. They were able to reach an agreement with the City to give the north lot to the City in exchange for the City allowing them to downsize the lot size requirement so they could divide the remaining property into three, 12,000 square foot lots. He said he supports the proposal to name the new park after Herbert Haines, who was a fixture in the area for a long time.

**Lance Nylander, Edmonds**, said he recently purchased a home near the new park that was constructed in 1936. He recalled that his father brought him to Haines Wharf as a child, and he returned as a teenager, as well. He said he found the history book that was written by Mr. Caryl to be interesting and well written. However, he recommended the park be named Fontal Park, the original name given to the area on November 8, 1871. He said he does not anticipate that Haines Wharf will go anywhere any time soon. The park would sit right behind the wharf and provide a perfect view of the dilapidated structure. He suggested that perhaps they could put something in the new park to recognize the history of Haines Wharf. However, naming the new park Fontal Park would pull visitors all the way back to the beginning history of Meadowdale. Hopefully, it would also inspire young people in the community to learn more about the history of the park. Lastly, Mr. Nylander said he lives at the bottom of the hill and would like to see additional speed limit signs installed for safety.

#### THE PUBLIC COMMENT PORTION OF THE HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Board Member Reed recalled that four or five years ago, there was a proposal before the City Council to renovate and update Haines Wharf, but the proposal failed because of the environmental restrictions that govern properties over the water. He asked if there is any possibility that Haines Wharf could be salvaged given the current environmental regulations. Mr. Chave answered that the wharf could be repaired under the current regulations, but no new structures could be erected.

Board Member Clarke asked Mr. McIntosh to share information about the new park's design. Mr. McIntosh reviewed that the new park would include a small grassy area on the plateau that would be enclosed by a small perimeter trail and new sidewalks and parking would be provided above the park. An overlook area would be created with funding from the David Stern Foundation that would include a scope, interpretive map and benches. A large rock pile is being assembled on the south slope, which will have a path leading to a hillside slide. A landscaped area will be located at the bottom of the slide, with some children's play equipment. In the northwest corner of the park, just beyond the perimeter path, would be a set of swings that will overlook the water and wharf. There is also a small plateau area where stones in the shape of sails would be installed. He noted that the park is small, but everyone who visits should enjoy it. He said they had not originally intended to provide parking at the top of the park, but they felt it was important to provide an opportunity for people in cars to park and enjoy the overlook, as well. He concluded that the park would be ADA accessible from 162<sup>nd</sup> Street.

Board Member Clarke asked if the benches would be similar to those installed in the downtown and at Hickman Park. Mr. McIntosh answered affirmatively and added that the benches are available to memorialize at a cost of \$2,000 each.

Board Member Clarke recalled that when Hickman Park was named, individuals submitted several requests that the park be named after Police Chief David Stern. At that time, the Board recommended that the name for the new north park should reference Chief Stern, instead. However, he did not see this proposal in the staff report. Mr. McIntosh said that no one actually submitted Chief Stern's name for the entire park, but the overlook would be designated as David Stern Overlook, and all the amenities would be paid for by the David Stern Foundation. A plaque would be installed at the overlook to commemorate his work and his life. Board Member Clarke asked if the name for the overlook has been established as fact. Mr. McIntosh answered that there has been no City Council resolution or official decision, but it was previously discussed before the Park Naming Policy was adopted. The overlook's name can be a mayor recommendation, which has been done in the past.

Board Member Clarke questioned if it would be appropriate for the Board to recommend the overlook be named after Chief David Stern as part of their recommendation to the City Council. Mr. McIntosh said he did not think this would be necessary, but the Board could certainly mention it in their recommendation. He suggested the Board focus their efforts on the actual park name, and then the overlook would be just a piece of the park.

Board Member Clarke referred to the plateau area that would have some maritime reference with sailboats and asked how far way this area is located from the overlook area. Mr. McIntosh answered that there is about a 10-foot separation between the two areas, and people visiting the overlook would be able to look out over the top of the sails. Board Member Clarke asked if the plateau area would have a bench, and Mr. McIntosh answered affirmatively. Board Member Clarke asked if an uneducated eye would recognize the areas as being separate, and Mr. McIntosh answered yes.

Board Member Stewart said she likes the park plan. She asked what was done to address stormwater runoff given that the property has a significant slope. She asked if the plans include pervious pavement or sidewalks, etc. Mr. McIntosh answered that no pervious sidewalks or pavement would be used. However, drainage was a concern and was adequately addressed. Board Member Stewart observed that this would have been a wonderful opportunity for the City to use pervious surfaces. She suggested that this be a consideration with future park projects.

Board Member Clarke said he visited every park in the City and categorized how they were named. He noted that before Hickman Park was named, the vast majority of parks in the City had been named based on their geographic location and character. He recalled that the most recent park was named Hickman Park after Dr. Hickman, with the play area being named after J.P. Patches to recognize both individuals. He expressed his belief that the new park does not have any distinct physical features that would lend to the name. He did a Google search of the individuals who had the highest recognition for the area and found references to both Mr. Caryl and Haines Wharf. Haines Wharf was referenced as a type of neighborhood. He also noted that the City's submission for capital improvements in the area references the location of the park as adjacent to the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad and across the railroad tracks from Haines Wharf. He suggested that Haines Wharf was used as a reference because everyone recognizes it. He summarized that both individuals come with a number of recommendations, and perhaps it would be appropriate to name the park, itself, Haines Wharf and the plateau area with the sailboat feature after Mr. Caryl. This would allow the City to recognize the contributions of both individuals and would preserve the history of the area.

Chair Pro Tem Guenther said he is a resident of the Meadowdale area and has lived in the neighborhood for a long time. When talking to people who have lived there even longer, they always recognize the area as Haines Wharf. He agreed the park should be named Haines Wharf, but perhaps one of the lower terraced areas could be named after Mr. Caryl.

Board Member Johnson said she has visited the park currently under construction and has read the results of the park naming contest. Of the 63 submissions, she counted 24 nominations that directly or indirectly referenced the Haines Fishing Wharf, 10 nominations to honor local resident Del Caryl and 9 nominations that reference the Puget Sound view. The City established a park naming policy with eight criteria, listed A through H. She said that based on her study, she found that Haines Fishing Wharf best meets the criteria for naming the park for the following reasons:

- A. It is both a geographic and descriptive location of the facility and has been a physical feature of the shoreline for seven decades.
- B. The Haines Fishing Wharf is an outstanding feature of the facility. It has been the subject of local artists Susan Waite and d'Elaine Johnson.
- C. This criterion does not apply.
- D. Haines Wharf subdivision is located nearby.
- E. This criterion does not apply.
- F. It is a commonly recognized and historical reference. More than the other suggestions, people familiar with Meadowdale are most likely to know the location of the new park by the name alone.
- G. Fred Holly, who contributed to the acquisition of the park land, spoke in favor of Haines Wharf Park.
- H. There were outstanding accomplishments of individuals in the Haines Family. Captain Haines and his two sons, Herbert and Jim, built and operated the fishing pier. Jim Haines was a member of the Edmonds Planning Board. He was also elected to the Edmonds City Council, Snohomish County Assessor, Snohomish County Commission, and Snohomish County Council. He also helped bring Stevens Hospital to Edmonds.

Board Member Stewart agreed with Board Member Johnson's recommendation. She expressed her belief that Haines Wharf is a very specific location that everyone in the community can relate to. She said that although she has lived in Edmonds for 23 years, she learned a lot of new information about the history of the area as she reviewed the proposed names. She

suggested the park also include an artistic drawing of what the wharf looked like in the early days and name the individuals that were instrumental in getting it to happen.

Board Member Cloutier agreed with Board Member Johnson's assessment, as well. He expressed his belief that Haines Wharf Park meets the intent of the Park Naming Policy. He said he also learned a lot from reading the historical records, especially those provided by Mr. Caryl. He said he would also like the park to recognize Del Caryl. In addition, he suggested the original name for the park, Fontal, should be referenced in the history information that is provided at the new park. He pointed out that naming the park after Haines Wharf would be an opportunity for people who haven't visited Edmonds in a long time to come back and reconnect with the history.

Board Member Reed supported Board Member Clarke's recommendation that the park, itself, be named after Captain Haines, but that Del Caryl's contribution to the community be recognized in some way, as well. He said it is important that park visitors recognize all of the history associated with the site.

**BOARD MEMBER CLARKE MOVED THE BOARD RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL THAT THE PERMANENT NAME FOR THE NEW PARK AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF 162<sup>ND</sup> STREET SOUTHWEST AND 75<sup>TH</sup> PLACE WEST SHOULD BE HAINES WHARF PARK. HE FURTHER MOVED THAT THAT THE PARK SHOULD ALSO RECOGNIZE THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF DELMAR CARYL, AS DISCUSSED BY THE BOARD, AND THAT INTERPRETIVE ARTWORK OR MEDIUM BE ADDED TO THE PARK THAT EXPLAINS THE HISTORY OF THE AREA AND THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE INDIVIDUALS THAT ARE RECOGNIZED. BOARD MEMBER STEWART SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**DISCUSSION ON CITY OF EDMONDS CLIMATE CHANGE ACTION PLAN**

Mr. Chave reminded the Board that the Mayor's Climate Protection Committee (MCPC) presented the Climate Change Action Plan to them on December 9, 2009. The Board agreed to postpone action on the item until each of the Board Members had an opportunity to thoroughly review the plan. Their discussion was continued to a future meeting.

Mr. Chave clarified that the Climate Change Action Plan is not intended to become an element of the Comprehensive Plan or any item that the City Council is required to formally adopt. It is intended to represent the MCPC's views and is a living document that would continue to evolve over time. The MCPC indicated they did not want the plan to be formally adopted since they intend to make changes as additional ideas and science comes forth. He summarized that the plan is a type of implementation strategy rather than more fixed goals and policies. The policies related to climate control are contained in the Community Sustainability Element of the Comprehensive Plan. Some of the actions identified in the plan can be addressed more immediately, and others will take longer to implement. However, the plan provides a blue print of the issues the MCPC would like to address. Again, he said the MCPC is not asking the Planning Board and/or City Council to adopt the document. However, the plan identifies actions that may be appropriate for the Board to address at some point in the future. They would like the Board and City Council to offer their support for the plan and recognize what the MCPC is trying to accomplish. While the Board may not agree with each of the items in the plan, they could offer their support for the overall approach.

**BOARD MEMBER STEWART MOVED THE BOARD ENDORSE THE CONTENTS OF THE EDMONDS CLIMATE CHANGE ACTION PLAN AND THE IMPLEMENTATION PLANS CONTAINED THEREIN. BOARD MEMBER REED SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Board Member Reed referred to Page 5 of the plan, which talks about the goal of reducing Green House Gas (GHG) emissions to 7% below the 1990 levels by 2012. He questioned if this would be an achievable goal to reduce emissions by 41% in just three years. Board Member Cloutier referred to the italicized statement at the bottom of Page 5, which points out that the goals may need to be adjusted to account for City annexations. He said the MCPC recognizes that as a result of annexations, the City's population has doubled since 1990. However, as per the Kyoto Agreement, the State has mandated that the City reduce their GHG emissions to 1990. However, the MCPC hopes to adjust the baseline numbers to include the annexed properties.

Board Member Reed pointed out that if the City Council adopts the plan, at some point the zoning codes would need to be amended to implement some of the actions called out in the plan. He asked if the City Council would provide direction and feedback as to what action items should be implemented first. He summarized that the overall plan is phenomenal and he likes that it contains action items rather than just theory.

Board Member Stewart suggested that perhaps the Board should invite the City Council to prioritize the action items identified on Page 17 of the report. Mr. Chave suggested that if the City Council were to pass a resolution of support for the plan, it would be appropriate for the Board to meet with them to discuss their priorities and identify the items they want the Board to work on. He said he shared the Board's work program with the City Council at their recent retreat, and it would be helpful for the Board to have a discussion with them about prioritization. Board Member Cloutier expressed his belief that the Economic Development Plan must go hand-in-hand with the Climate Change Action Plan and the Board's work program.

Board Member Johnson said she was very impressed by the number of participants and partners involved in creating the plan; it was a well-coordinated effort. However, she expressed concern about the context of the action plan. For example, how did Edmonds increase GHG by 34% since 1990? She said understanding more about why GHG increased in the City would be helpful. She appreciated the explanation provided by Board Member Cloutier related to the 1990 baseline and how subsequent annexation has changed the baseline. She questioned how the baseline was measured. She also expressed concern about the summary, "by 2012, Edmonds GHG must be reduced by at least 41% to meet Kyoto Protocol." She said that when she sees the word "require," she is led to believe that it is a legal requirement. Requiring that the changes must be in place by 2012 is different than identifying it as a goal the City wants to achieve. She said she is also unclear as to the actions needed to achieve the goals identified in the plan. She observed that while the plan is intended to be a vision for the next 40 years, some of the items are immediate and others will take more time. She said she does not understand the priorities and the timing of the actions.

Board Member Johnson reminded the Board of how the Transportation Advisory Committee advanced the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan. The plan contained a long list of projects and programs, and implementation of the projects was identified in the 6-year Capital Improvement Program. If the MCPC is asking the City Council to hire staff and make significant changes to implement the plan, they need to identify the costs and benefits associated with these actions. She observed that, at this time, about 83% of the GHG emission reductions are tied to transportation, land use and building. She said she was pleased to see some correlation between walking and reducing GHG. However, she was looking for more relationship between actions and results. She suggested that before the plan is forwarded to the City Council, the MCPC needs to provide a clear understanding of what their goals are and how they can best be achieved.

Board Member Clarke observed that this topic has a lot of energy associated with it and there are individuals on both sides with strong feelings. There are some who believe that if you do not accept the climate change theory you have your head in the sand. There are others who believe that much of the data that has been analyzed and put forth recently by supposedly knowledgeable individuals with integrity has turned out to be bogus. The rate of climate change is under considerable debate at this time. Just today on the internet there was an interesting illustration that shows the climate differences between Seattle, California, and Washington D.C. The east coast is currently experiencing record snow fall, which adds fuel to the fire of the debate. He said he has looked at the studies for a number of years, and is concerned at the opinions that have already been expressed. It is difficult to change baseline numbers to identify a starting point and then decide how to quantify the change based on the goals in the plan. Although the City increased in size by more than a third, the plan uses baseline numbers that were established in 1990 before the annexations occurred. Regardless of the policies, the City must adjust the data to show the changes that resulted from the annexations. He questioned the City's ability to reach the proposed reduction levels within three years, particularly since the plan does not provide any direction on how this goal would be accomplished.

Board Member Clarke summarized that there is so much tension in the City between different segments of the community. He suggested it would be foolish for the Board to get themselves into a political trap of having the City Council give them specific mandates to put into zoning and land use regulations to implement a plan that may or may not have realistic goals to begin with. He said he is not sure there has been enough debate about what the report tells about the priorities of the action items. He questioned how the action items could be prioritized on a cost/benefit basis and who would be responsible for the

prioritization. He suggested the Board get these issues cleared up before they forward the plan to the City Council. He recalled what happened with the economic development challenges over the past year. It was difficult to bring such a large group of commissioners together to work on an action plan that can really make a difference. Although he has a lot of respect for the Climate Change Action Plan, he has trouble offering his full support and forwarding it to the City Council.

Mr. Chave emphasized that the Board is not being asked to forward a recommendation to the City Council regarding the action plan. Instead, they have been invited to offer their independent support for whether or not they think the plan is worthwhile for the City to start working on. Once again, he suggested that after the City Council has had an opportunity to review the plan, it would be helpful for the Board to meet jointly with them to discuss and prioritize the action items. He explained that in the future, the MCPC may bring items before the Board for action, but it is important to keep in mind that the MCPC owns the plan. They are attempting to reach out to others who have control over some of the action items to try and bridge the gap and get everyone on the same page.

Board Member Clarke said he would like the MCPC to provide three recommendations for priority actions and a process for measuring to determine if the established goals are achievable within the identified timeframe. He expressed concern that having too many action items results in confusion. It is the MCPC's job to be more specific.

Mr. Chave reminded the Board that some of the items on their 2010 work program have a connection with the action items identified in the plan. He suggested the Board should look for opportunities to implement the action items as they progress through their 2010 work program. For example, rather than using the traditional approach to parking standards, the Board could identify how the parking standards would impact the recommendations in the action plan. He suggested that at a joint meeting with the City Council, the Board could identify the things that are already on their work program that are also reflected in the Community Sustainability Element and the Climate Change Action plan. They could ask the City Council to also identify other items they would like the Board to work on throughout the year.

Board Member Stewart said she appreciates Board Member Clarke's concern about how much is in the action plan and how difficult it might be to achieve the goals. She said she served on a National Committee that identified lofty goals for Healthy People 2000. As it turned out, the goals were not obtained. However, it is still important to put forth goals, keep your eyes on the horizon and do everything possible to measure success along the way to make sure you are accountable. It is also important to look back and see what you could have done better. She expressed her belief that the plan is a good start. Whether you believe in climate control or not, you cannot dispute what is happening with air quality. There are a number of things that should be addressed from a sustainability standpoint in regard to the City's future. Endorsing the document would simply say the Board accepts the conceptual framework that exists and would like to work with it as best they can. She agreed it would be helpful to have a discussion with the City Council about priorities and how to move both the Community Sustainability Element and the Climate Change Action Plan forward.

Chair Pro Tem Guenther agreed the plan is a good start, but some of the goals may go too far such as promoting solar access at the expense of cutting down trees. In other areas, he felt the plan did not go far enough to address sustainability. The plan dealt more with trying to reduce GHG's and fossil fuel consumption than trying to incorporate sustainability elements.

Mr. Chave said he does not interpret the goals in the action plan as absolute requirements that must be accomplished by a certain date. At this time, the MCPC is struggling with the goals and trying to figure out what to do and when. The plan does not represent a fixed blue print on how they will proceed. Chair Pro Tem Guenther agreed that the plan is intended to be a living document than can be changed and fined tuned.

Mr. Chave reminded the Board that the MCPC is already working to address the baseline issue, which does not provide an accurate picture of the magnitude of the problem. Regardless of whether or not the City can achieve the goals, they need to start working towards them. The goals have been established statewide and the City cannot ignore them. He pointed out that when the City applies for grant funding, the state is looking for local governments who have acknowledged the requirements and have goals and plans in place to accomplish them.

Board Member Johnson asked if the MCPC has invited the Board to submit their questions and comments regarding the plan so it can be revised or is this the final report and the Board is being asked to endorse it as currently written. Chair Pro Tem

Guenther pointed out that changes were made to the document since the Board's last review, and it would continue to evolve. He expressed his belief that the MCPC would welcome the Board's input regarding the plan. Board Member Johnson asked about the best way to communicate the Board's comments back to the MCPC. Chair Pro Tem Guenther suggested the Board Members email their comments back to staff, and staff would forward them to the MCPC. Mr. Chave also pointed out that staff would forward the minutes of the Board's discussion to the MCPC for review.

Board Member Clarke said it appears to be common sense that reducing automobiles would reduce GHG's, reducing the parking requirements would reduce automobiles, and reducing automobiles would force people to use mass transit. However, it is also important to consider how these changes would impact the City from an economic and land use standpoint. There are certain balances that must be weighed and there must be a forum for expressing this rather than throwing out blanket ideas for meeting the goals. For example, requiring that solar easements be placed on property titles can be problematic. As technology changes and solar power is no longer the best choice, it will be difficult if not impossible to remove the easement from the title. He suggested that many of the action items have not been well-thought out, and they are not based on the principles of economics and real estate law. He suggested the Board be very cautious about supporting things that are not backed up by studies, particularly if they will have an impact on land use in the downtown.

Board Member Reed said that as the Board discusses various issues related to sustainability, they will consider not only the action plan, but other aspects of implementation, as well. They will work hard to make the best recommendations based on all of the available guidelines and information. When specific requests are put forward, the Board can have a serious discussion about the recommendations in the plan and how they will impact the community.

Board Member Clarke referred to the Firdale Village Proposal and reminded the Board that the City Council changed the proposal before approving it. Board Member Reed reminded the Board that the City Council is responsible for making final decisions, and sometimes their actions are different than what the Board recommends. This is how the political process is supposed to work, even when a decision is made that the Board doesn't agree with. The Board must continue to do their best to forward recommendations to the City Council, recognizing that the City Council would make the final decision.

**THE MOTION CARRIED 5-0-1, WITH BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON ABSTAINING.**

Board Member Johnson said she would prefer to send the document back to the MCPC for additional changes prior to the Board's endorsement. Board Member Stewart suggested that Board Member Johnson attend a future MCPC meeting to get her questions answered. She reminded the Board that the plan is a living document. The ideas contained in the plan are good, but she recognized that some things still need to be worked on.

Chair Pro Tem Guenther emphasized that the Board just voted to endorse the document, and not adopt it. He said he hopes the document is not presented to the City Council until the MCPC receives the Board's comments.

**REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA**

Mr. Chave advised that he was unable to meet with Chair Bowman and Vice Chair Lovell to prepare an extended agenda, but a new draft should be available for the Board's review at their February 24<sup>th</sup> meeting. He announced that at their next meeting, the Board would discuss the interim ordinances that have been referred to them by the City Council. A representative from the City Attorney's Office would be present to work with the Board.

Board Member Clarke requested an update on the waterfront land use application. Mr. Chave answered that it is currently in the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) process, and no schedule has been identified for when the item would come before the Board for a public hearing and review. Board Member Reed said he recently learned that the applicant is revising some of the specifications of the application and would submit a revised plan. The changes have to do with a letter the applicant received from the City indicating they would likely issue a Determination of Significance for the proposed project, which would trigger a SEPA review. Board Member Clarke requested an update on the double tracking project. Mr. Chave said this is a Sound Transit Project that is currently moving forward.

**PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS**

**APPROVED**

Chair Pro Tem Guenther did not provide any comments during this portion of the meeting.

**PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS**

Board Member Stewart referred to the list of organizations that support economic development in Edmonds, which was attached to the Planning Board's section of the Economic Development Report. She noted that the Edmonds Floretum Club should be added to the list, and she apologized for omitting the group.

Board Member Stewart announced that a lecture series on green and sustainable building practices will begin on February 23<sup>rd</sup>. She noted that some City Council Members indicated a desire to learn more about LEED and sustainable building practices, and she felt this would be a good opportunity. She agreed to forward the information to staff so they could pass it along to the City Council. She indicated that she would attend the February 23<sup>rd</sup> event, and would be willing to carpool with others who are interested in attending.

Board Member Reed welcomed Board Members Cloutier and Johnson to the Board. He apologized for missing meetings in November, December and January as he traveled for work.

Board Member Clark expressed appreciation to Board Member Reed for taking the time to share his thoughts in writing prior to each Board Meeting that he was unable to attend. He also recognized Board Member Stewart's efforts to put together the Board's portion of the Economic Development Report.

Chair Pro Tem Guenther announced that staff provided handouts for the Board's copies of the Comprehensive Plan. Background information regarding the Climate Change Action Plan were also provided prior to the meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The Board meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.