

**APPROVED AUGUST 25<sup>TH</sup>**

**CITY OF EDMONDS  
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

**August 11, 2010**

---

---

Chair Lovell 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**

Philip Lovell, Chair  
John Reed, Vice Chair  
Kevin Clarke  
Todd Cloutier  
Kristiana Johnson  
Valerie Stewart

**STAFF PRESENT**

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager  
Brian McIntosh, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director  
Rich Lindsay, Parks Maintenance Manager  
Karin Noyes, Recorder

**READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**VICE CHAIR REED MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JULY 28, 2010 AS AMENDED. BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON 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 RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO THE STREET TREE PLAN ELEMENT OF THE EDMONDS STREETScape PLAN**

Mr. McIntosh reminded the Board that on May 26, 2009, the City Council requested a review of the Street Tree Plan in response to concerns regarding removal and replacement of street trees, particularly in the downtown and specifically at the corner of 5<sup>th</sup> and Dayton. The City Council recommended changes to better reflect the City's current practices for removing and replanting trees, specifically the caliper of replacement trees. He advised that subsequent to the May 26, 2009, City Council Meeting, the question of replacing and retaining the mature trees at 5<sup>th</sup> and Dayton was discussed several times throughout the late summer and fall. At the suggestion of the Public Works Director, it was agreed to review the entire Street Tree Plan in the new year beginning with staff review. He noted that while the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services staff has assisted the Public Works staff in updating the Street Tree Plan, the Public Works staff is responsible for implementing the code requirements.

Mr. McIntosh reviewed that staff presented proposed language for updating the Street Tree Plan at the Board's July 14<sup>th</sup> meeting, and they provided thoughtful comments that were incorporated into the current draft language. He explained that the updated language is intended to expand upon the plan and to recognize new techniques and attitudes that have come into play since the plan was last updated in 2006. He referred to the draft language and highlighted the following changes:

- **Page 118 – Vision.** Additional language was added to this section to recognize the ecological value that street trees can provide. It recommends that native trees and new technologies be used whenever possible in tree and sidewalk restoration and construction. It also points out that street tree planting or replacement creates opportunities to consider drainage techniques such as bio swales and other natural storm drainage methods. The language reserves the right of the City to amend or modify the tree species selection in the future as things change.
- **Page 119 – Context.** Additional language was added to note that Edmonds is a certified Community Wildlife Habitat City and that street trees should contribute to the Sustainability Element of the City’s Comprehensive Plan.
- **Page 120 – Design.** An additional bullet was added to state that, wherever practical, the City should consider the largest tree caliper available and appropriate for each site.
- **Page 120 -- Species Selection.** Two additional bullets were added to require an applicant consider native species wherever possible and to emphasize that street tree species should tolerate air and water pollution and provide air/water quality benefits through absorption of oils and other toxins.
- **Page 121 – Maintenance.** The first bullet was changed to emphasize the importance of using new technologies such as Silva cell systems.
- **Page 121 – Implementation.** The first bullet item was changed to state that when streets and sidewalks are built or reconstructed, existing trees should be considered individually in regard to tree health and suitability for the site. All reasonable preservation alternatives to removal of the existing trees should be considered. It further states that the largest possible caliper of appropriate tree should be planted.
- **Page 122 – Existing Trees.** The language in the first paragraph was changed to place more emphasis on existing landmark trees.
- **Pages 125 and 126.** In these sections, all references to tree caliper were changed to “a preferred 3-inch, but not less than 2-inch caliper.”
- **Page 127 – Planting Procedures.** The third paragraph was modified by removing the third sentence, which made reference to a technique that is no longer considered appropriate.
- **Page 128 – Spacing.** Two new sentences were added to this section to point out that spacing may need to be increased dependent upon tree species and its branching characteristics in relation to planned uses adjacent to the planting.
- **Page 131 – Treat for Disease.** An additional sentence was added to require the use of effective and environmentally sensitive integrated pest management principles and approaches in dealing with pest management and disease.
- **Pages 116 and 117.** The street tree list was modified to identify “Columnaris/Columnar Sergeant Cherry” as a prohibited street tree species. In addition, “Amanagawa Cherry” was placed on the list of street trees approved with reservations because it is not considered appropriate for the downtown.

Mr. McIntosh distributed copies of two written comments that were received today from Susan Paine and Rich Senderoff. He advised that he did not have an opportunity to thoroughly review the submittals and incorporate changes into the draft update. However, he agreed that Mr. Senderoff and Ms. Paine raised some valid issues.

Board Member Stewart commended staff for doing a fine job of revising the document as per the Board’s July 14<sup>th</sup> discussion. However, she referred to the 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet in the “Maintenance” section on Page 121 and the 4<sup>th</sup> sentence in the “Pruning” section on Page 130, which both talk about “topping” trees. She observed that the language used on Page 130 provides more direction. She suggested that because topping trees is not good for their health or appearance, the language on Page 130 should also be used on Page 121.

Vice Chair Reed suggested the words “wherever possible” be deleted from the last bullet in the “Design” section and the first bullet in the “Species Selection” section on Page 120. He also suggested the term “when possible” be removed from the 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence in the 1<sup>st</sup> bullet in the “Implementation” section. He expressed concern that the last sentence in the “Spacing” section on Page 128 appears to give permission to private property owners to over prune trees to provide better exposure to their business or view. He recommended the language be changed to only allow City staff to prune street trees.

Board Member Cloutier referred to the 1<sup>st</sup> bullet item in the “Regulatory” section on Page 121, which states that adjacent property owners are responsible for tree planting and maintenance except where otherwise defined by the City. He asked if there are more detailed guidelines in other sections of the code that would apply to street trees. If not, he expressed concern that property owners would be required to maintain the trees without any idea of what the City’s expectations are. He also

referred to the 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet item in the same section, which requires coordination for any work within the City's right-of-ways. He asked if the City has outlined a process for this coordination to occur. Mr. McIntosh answered that this type of work would require a permit from the City's Engineering Department. Board Member Cloutier noted that the 4<sup>th</sup> bullet item in the section indicates that the City should provide incentives for private property owners to preserve substantial trees, yet there is no indication as to what those incentives might be. Mr. McIntosh answered that these types of broader issues would be addressed by the Street Tree Advisory Group, which is currently being formed.

Board Member Johnson pointed out that the proposed language (Page 125) states that Kwansan is a preferred tree for the Five Corners area, yet it is not included on the list provided in the section. In addition, she suggested that the last sentence in the "Five Corners" section be changed to read, ". . . extend all the way down Main Street from Five Corners to downtown . . ." She referred to the last sentence in the "Existing Regulatory Requirements" section on Page 119 that states that the Architectural Design Board (ADB) reviews and approves planting plans for new development seeking a permit, including street planting as part of a private development. She asked if the ADB performs this review for all projects in the City or only those that otherwise require ADB review. Vice Chair Reed recalled that the Point Edwards Homeowner's Association recently requested a change to the Street Tree Plan that was approved by the ADB. The ADB reviewed the request and granted approval of the change. He summarized that whenever a private developer seeks to change an approved street tree plan, ADB review and approval would be required.

Board Member Johnson questioned why Amanagawa Cherry is listed as a recommended small, narrow tree species when it is identified as not allowed on the Street Tree List. Chair Lovell pointed out that while it is not a desirable street tree for the downtown area, it could be used appropriately in other locations in the City. Therefore, it has been identified as "approved with reservations."

Board Member Stewart asked if the ADB confers with the City's arborist when street tree plans are presented for their review and approval. Mr. McIntosh answered that the City does not have a full-time arborist on staff, but they do have an individual who has arborist experience.

Board Member Clarke agreed with Vice Chair Reed that the last sentence in the "Spacing" section on Page 128 appears to give private property owners permission to prune trees. He suggested the language needs to provide guidelines related to pruning, which includes oversight by City staff. Mr. McIntosh agreed that the sentence should be reworded because it is intended to identify a behavior the City does not want to allow.

Board Member Clarke referred to the 1<sup>st</sup> bullet in the "Regulatory" section on Page 121 and asked staff to provide examples of when a private property owner would be responsible for planting a tree within a public right-of-way. Mr. Lindsay explained that developers are frequently required to plant street trees within the public right-of-ways for the benefit of the City, and staff provides guidance and direction on how to use best management practices, etc.

Chair Lovell suggested that when the document is forwarded to the City Council, it should be updated to identify the latest effective date. He asked if the Public Works Department staff keeps apprised of new technology. He observed that research has found that some types of pervious pavement is not working well. Mr. McIntosh explained that when the Public Works Department investigated the situation at 5<sup>th</sup> and Dayton, they did a lot of research on pervious and rubber sidewalks, etc. However, none of this technology has been used in Edmonds. There is currently a lot of debate, and he has heard that some technologies have been proven very successful. While their effectiveness may diminish over time, it does not totally go away. The better the pervious surfaces are maintained, the more effectively they perform. He summarized that the Public Works Department uses best management practices when replacing or developing sidewalks, but there have not been very many projects of this type over the last few years.

**Rich Senderoff, Edmonds**, said he received a copy of the updated language just this afternoon, and submitted his initial comments in writing. He noted that most of his comments are self-explanatory, and many are related to questions raised by the Board. He suggested the language could be reworded to become stronger. Words such as "are encouraged," could be replaced with "is expected." This would be consistent with the City Council's decision regarding the terms "should" and "shall" in the Firdale Village Rezone. He also suggested the tree list could become more useful if it provided specific information about the trees. For example, it could identify trees that are native and the mature dimensions and suitable

locations for each species. It could also recommend the best time to prune each of the species, as well as any special requirements for soil, water, etc. Perhaps a picture could also be provided.

Mr. Senderoff said it would be helpful for the City to provide written guidance to private property owners regarding pruning. Perhaps they could require a property owner to sign a form indicating that they received the information and understand the City's regulations. In addition, he recommended no grass hydro seeding be allowed in the area where new street trees are planted. He shared an example of a property owner in his neighborhood who planted 8 street trees and then hydro seeded the entire area. He suggested this is the likely reason why six of the trees have died, and the remaining two are not healthy. While he does not consider himself a tree hugger, he has always enjoyed and appreciated the natural environment. He recalled that he chose his first apartment because there was a tree growing outside the living room window. He noted that some people consider trees to be their views.

**Susan Paine, Edmonds**, said she is an analyst for the City of Seattle's Department of Transportation, Right-of-Way Management Division, and she frequently works with their arborist. She said it is great to see Edmonds is working to update their Street Tree Plan. She advised that, at this time, the City of Seattle is working to implement the requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit, which will have a significant impact on how they manage their right-of-ways. She reminded the Board that the City experiences significant flooding issues on Dayton Avenue near the old Safeway property. Because trees help control flooding, the regulations related to trees should be a key element of the City's stormwater code. She noted that the NPDES permit is a national permit that is intended to protect Puget Sound.

Ms. Paine referred to the City of Seattle's Right-of-Way Improvement Manual, which provides great examples of bio swales that allow for natural drainage. She pointed out that even though private developers would be required to install the street trees in public right-of-ways, the City should consider the trees to be a community asset. They should have a plan in place for protecting and maintaining the trees so they can perform their full ecological value. She questioned if the City has canopy requirements in place to help them make future decisions. She summarized that a Street Tree Plan can provide cohesiveness for neighborhood districts, but there must also be a maintenance plan in place. She suggested that in the future, it is likely that street trees will have a higher priority in the City of Seattle's Right-of-Way Improvement Manual than utilities because of the ecological benefits they provide by absorbing much of the water that flows to Puget Sound. That means they will have to manage the right-of-way in a very extensive way, which will require a strong management system.

Board Member Reed noted that Ms. Paine provided a lot of comments regarding the proposed language, but he questioned if she also provided some recommended language for the Board to consider. Ms. Paine answered that her proposed verbiage changes are highlighted in purple. She suggested the language could be strengthened overall, and Edmonds must decide if they want to take the steps necessary to become a Tree City USA.

**Anna Heckman, Edmonds**, said that she is a certified arborist, and most of her comments were already addressed by earlier Board discussion. She said she has significant experience working with city codes and doing tree installations. Based on her experience she suggested it would be in the City's best interest to:

- Require a certified arborist to review the plans, especially when they are done by private developers who are looking out for their own best interests. She reminded the Board that once the street trees are installed, maintenance typically becomes the City's responsibility, so it is important that the right trees are planted, and that they are planted correctly.
- Require property owners to consult with an arborist if private pruning is allowed. Not everyone knows how to correctly prune. If the City allows private property owners to prune on a case-by-case basis, there will likely be situations where trees are "hacked up." It would be in the City's best interest to invest early rather than try to maintain improperly pruned trees in the future.
- Identify native trees on the street tree list. The proposed language encourages the use of native trees, but there are no native species included on the list. There are numerous native trees that would be suitable as street trees, and the language should allow the City's arborist to approve native trees that are considered appropriate for a street environment.
- Allow conifer street trees in some locations. While they are not appropriate in many locations, there are some varieties that would be appropriate in locations such as center lane areas. She noted that conifers represent the majority of the areas native trees.

THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Vice Chair Reed suggested the Board continue the public hearing to a future date to allow the Board and the public additional time to review the draft language, as well as the public comments provided to date. He said he would like staff to consider the changes recommended by the public and bring an updated draft back for the continued hearing.

Board Member Clarke said he was impressed and overwhelmed by the expert knowledge provided by the citizens who spoke during the hearing. He noted that these individuals had very little time to review and comment on the document, and they would likely have more input to provide if the public hearing were continued. He suggested their knowledge and expertise could be a valuable resource as the Board moves forward with their recommendation.

Chair Lovell asked if the City has a full-time arborist on staff who could work with members of the public to update the plan further. Mr. Lindsay answered that the City does not have a full-time arborist on staff, but they do have a staff member who has experience as an arborist. Mr. McIntosh noted that, at this time, the staff person only dedicates a small percentage of time to the arborist responsibilities. Mr. Chave said the ADB has not been able to have the services of a City arborist because there is not a full-time employee devoted to review all public and private projects. Board Member Clarke asked if there is a mechanism to allow individuals with arborist expertise to review development plans as a volunteer service to the City. Mr. Chave explained that a prime direction in development review is that the reviews are consistent. Using volunteers with different expertise and background to review development application could be problematic.

Board Member Stewart recalled that the City Council is in the process of creating a separate tree board, which would include qualified professional volunteers. Perhaps this new board could be called upon to review projects, as well. They could also provide a service in other areas where the City would benefit from an arborist's expertise.

Mr. McIntosh reminded the Board that the City would begin the process of updating their Streetscape Plan in 2011, and the Street Tree Plan is just one element of that document. Therefore, the Street Tree Plan will be up for review again next fall, and the City would likely hire a consultant to help them with this work. It appears there will also be a citizen's advisory tree board in place with expertise to go a little deeper to address some of the issues raised during the public hearing.

Board Member Stewart said she supports Ms. Paine's suggestion that the City incorporate trees into their low-impact development and green infrastructure strategies.

Board Member Johnson said she recently reviewed the City's Streetscape Plan, which addresses a number of the issues raised during the public hearing such as photographs of trees that are ideal and their planting instructions. It also provides guidance that the areas surrounding newly planted trees should be left alone until the trees are established. It talks about bio swales and natural drainage, as well. She reminded the Board that the Street Tree Plan is before the Board at the direction of the City Council to address the issues of replacement tree caliper and the removal of certain trees. She suggested that some of the comments provided by the Board and the public would be more appropriately addressed by the citizens advisory tree board in preparation for the City's review of the entire Streetscape Plan next year, such as identifying significant trees, creating a brochure, and becoming a Tree City U.S.A.. These are not necessarily issues the Planning Board should address at this time, but they could be shared with the citizens advisory tree board in the future.

Chair Lovell observed that the Street Tree Plan appears to be put together well. If more input is desired or deemed appropriate relative to the overall Streetscape Plan, Stormwater Management Plan, etc., perhaps that is something to be handled by the proposed citizens advisory tree board. What they have before them now is the Street Tree Plan, which seems to be adequate for the time being.

Board Member Johnson referred to Ms. Heckman's testimony that there are a number of native street tree species that could be added to the list of approved trees. She suggested it would be beneficial to make this adjustment.

**APPROVED**

Mr. Chave suggested that rather than continuing the hearing to a date certain, the Board could close the hearing and direct staff to work with those who testified to incorporate their comments into the draft. Once a new draft has been prepared, a second public hearing could be scheduled and advertised to the public. The Board agreed that would be appropriate.

Chair Lovell said it is important that the document does not morph into something greater than it is intended to be. The Streetscape Plan covers many of the issues that have been discussed, and the Street Tree Plan is only one component of the Streetscape Plan.

#### **UPDATE ON HIGHWAY 99 PARKING STANDARDS (FILE NUMBER AMD20090009)**

Mr. Chave advised that staff would begin their research on potential options for updating the Highway 99 parking standards. He requested the Board provide direction on whether or not it would be appropriate to pursue the following two options:

- **No minimum parking standard for those properties that front on Highway 99.** The logic behind no minimum parking standard is partially to encourage more transit-oriented development. When property is developed, a developer typically provides the amount of parking they believe is necessary for the site. If the property is located near a transit station, a developer may want to provide less parking than if the property is located further from the transit options. The situation on Highway 99 differs from that of the downtown. If a developer does not supply enough parking, there would not typically be an option to park in front of another business.
- **A minimum standard that is applied uniformly across the entire area.** The difficult thing about applying a uniform maximum standard is figuring out what the reasonable minimum should be. The intent is not to provide a standard that creates a “sea of asphalt” that is underutilized most of the year. Traditional parking standards are based on maximum typical uses, which are determined by peak periods over the course of a year. In many areas there are lots that are underutilized most of the year until the peak season, which is not the highest and best use of the land. A uniform minimum parking standard would be more efficiently applied when property values rise to the point where underground parking is feasible. While this is not true for the Highway 99 Corridor at this time, it is definitely possible in the coming years.

Mr. Chave explained that the traditionally parking standard currently in place along Highway 99 is based on the types of uses. When a use changes, staff must evaluate and determine if there is space to meet the parking requirements associated with the new use. The use would only be allowed if the parking requirement could be met. Staff would prefer a more uniform approach that takes the use equation out of the decision. This type of standard would be easier to administer and provide more predictability to property owners who are trying to lease their space.

Mr. Chave observed that the concept of removing the parking standard altogether is a bit radical, but some jurisdictions have even gone one step further to establish a maximum parking standard. Their intent is to clamp down on parking and push people to use the transit facilities. He said he does not believe the City is ready to go that far, but they should have a frank discussion regarding the option of no minimum parking standard.

Chair Lovell pointed out that the success of the “no minimum standard” approach would depend on development teams that include qualified individuals who can identify the amount of parking that would be necessary for the proposed use. Mr. Chave agreed and said this would be true for both residential and commercial development. He added that lenders often have parking requirements that must be met in order for developers to obtain funding for projects. He observed that developers have a vested interest in making sure there is adequate parking to serve the tenants and customers of a new building. They may propose a reduction in parking if a market analysis indicates the customers and tenants could arrive by bus. He agreed there is some risk involved with this option.

Vice Chair Reed asked if the reduced parking standard would apply only to those properties that front along Highway 99 or if it would apply to adjacent properties, as well. Mr. Chave said the reduced standard would only apply to the Highway 99 Corridor at this time. Parking standards for the remainder of the activity center would be addressed as a separate issue. He said he would not likely advocate a “no minimum parking” standard for the activity center.

The Board agreed it would be appropriate for staff to pursue the two options outlined earlier by Mr. Chave.

**APPROVED**

Board Member Stewart said she is leaning towards a “no minimum parking” standard. She said she is aware of condominiums and apartments in Seattle that charge extra for their parking spaces. If there is great public transportation, this approach can be used as a social engineering ploy to get people to use the public transportation that is available. Some municipalities also offer density bonuses when fewer parking spaces are provided. The existing pavement on Highway 99 is unattractive, and the City should encourage the concept of green space and plantings to enhance the environment. There is a great opportunity on Highway 99 to accomplish this goal due to the new SWIFT Bus Line. If they make the area attractive and green, she suspects people will start to buy off on the idea.

Board Member Cloutier recalled staff’s earlier comment that one of the problems with the traditional parking standard is that staff is required to review the parking requirements each time a use is changed. He encouraged the Board to keep in mind the problem they are trying to solve first. He said he is willing to consider the concept of a “no minimum parking” standard, but he would like information from other jurisdictions about how the approach has worked for them.

Board Member Johnson said she would like more information from staff about why they are proposing changes to the parking standard for Highway 99 and what problems they are trying to solve. Particularly on Highway 99, there are numerous options for addressing the issues. For example, the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan recommends highway access management on the corridor and talks about shared driveways, shared parking, etc. There are many examples from throughout the region related to parking, such as giving credit for mode/split, which takes advantage of the transportation corridor.

Board Member Clarke suggested staff provide actual examples where a “no minimum parking” standard has been applied in a suburban environment. He noted that Kirkland made the decision that developers in their downtown could pay into a parking fund in lieu of building parking space. However, the parking was never built. Mr. Chave said the City of Edmonds had a similar program, and it was abolished for the same reason. Board Member Clarke cautioned against implementing pioneer ideas that allow structures to be developed with minimal parking because it could result in functional problems for future tenants and decreased land values. Mr. Chave said the same concern could be raised about the current parking standard. Developers do not know what the parking demand will be for future uses. He summarized that it would make more sense to have a uniform standard across the Board because the City has no control over future uses.

Board Member Clarke announced that the Environmental Protection Agency has published a primer titled, “*Parking Space/Community Places: Finding the Balance Through Smart Growth Solutions*.” He agreed to forward a link to the website so Board Members could review the document.

#### **UPDATE ON SUSTAINABILITY INDICATORS**

Board Member Cloutier reported that the Sustainability Indicator Subcommittee met with Carl Nelson, Information Systems Director, to discuss options for hosting sustainability indicators on the City’s website using existing software and available staff time. He indicated that he was open to trying new ideas. The next step is to prepare a draft of what the website should look like and then decide how best to make it work. Mr. Nelson was open to the ideas the subcommittee presented for a potential indicator display system, and he encouraged them to search other jurisdictions’ sites for examples. They intend to use a “keep it simple” approach. He advised that the subcommittee will work in tandem with the Mayor’s Climate Protection Committee to move forward with the first sustainability indicator related to “energy consumption and buildings.”

Chair Lovell asked how the data would be input onto the website. Board Member Cloutier advised that he is currently working on an energy conservation pilot program titled, Save Energy Now, which is sponsored by Sustainable Edmonds. They are currently working with Puget Sound Energy (PSE) and the Snohomish County Public Utility District (PUD), and they have provided usage numbers for the entire City of Edmonds that will be input onto the website. Because they already have the necessary data, the goal is to work out the process using this very simple indicator.

Board Member Johnson asked if the data from the PUD and PSE is aggregate or property specific. Board Member Cloutier answered that it is aggregate. It cannot be made specific without the consent of each property owner. However, all City

buildings are already being tracked by the City's Facilities Manager. Their goal is to obtain an Energy Star rating from the EPA.

### **REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA**

Chair Lovell announced that the August 25<sup>th</sup> agenda would include a public hearing on the Meadowdale Annexation Zoning, a discussion on Tent City/Homeless Shelter Regulations, and a presentation of the draft Capital Facilities Plan.

### **PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS**

Chair Lovell inquired if Vice Chair Reed was able to gather all of the information he was seeking relative to the Levy Committee's activities. Vice Chair Reed answered that he reviewed the minutes from the City Council Meeting at which the Levy Committee presented their report. He also received handouts of all the presentations that were made by staff.

Vice Chair Reed pointed out that the vacant Board positions have not been advertised on the City's website. Vice Chair Reed noted that the vacancies were advertised in the local newspapers, but no information was provided about where to obtain an application. Mr. Chave advised that Mayor Cooper has decided to extend the recruitment period and staff would follow through by advertising the positions on the City's website.

### **PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS**

Board Member Stewart reported that she participated in two of three sessions of a webinar, sponsored by ICLEI-Local Governments for Sustainability USA. The event was titled, *Supporting Green Building: Aligning Codes with Policy*. While she missed the first presentation, the second presentation was provided by Peter DuBois, Clark County Sustainability Coordinator and Coordinator of the Sustainable Communities Pilot Project, which identifies projects within their county that could be used for eco-village type development that is built green. The project is funded by the Department of Ecology. The program includes a declaration ordinance relative to green building, as well as education, monitoring, and training. They created voluntary green building standards in their code and provided incentives to encourage developers to participate in the program.

Board Member Stewart reported that the last presentation was by Gabrielle Schiffer from the State of Oregon Building Codes Division. She spoke about the work of the Oregon Building Codes Division over the past several years to improve the environmental performance of the State's Building Codes, as well as how local governments and the State can partner on green building. They created a "green building" link on their website, which addresses four specific areas: energy efficiency, renewable energy and green technology, gray water use and rain water harvesting, and electric vehicle deployment. She summarized that both presentations provided wonderful ideas, and she would forward links to the PowerPoint presentations to each Board Member.

Vice Chair Reed reported that the Levy Committee has met twice, and four subcommittees have been formed to deal with general fund expenditures, general fund revenues, capital expenditures, and other funds and transfers. The meetings are open to the public, and the next one is scheduled for August 26<sup>th</sup> at 5:30 p.m. on the third floor of City Hall.

Vice Chair Reed reported that he recently read the Port of Edmonds Commission Meeting Minutes of June 28<sup>th</sup> to learn more about what is currently taking place with their Harbor Square Redevelopment Project. The Commission discussed how they viewed the information provided at the public open house and what their next step would be. They also reviewed their recent site visit to Mill Creek Town Center and another development in Everett. They have engaged the services of students from the University of Washington to complete a view shed analysis, and they are talking with other groups about potential concepts and developing community interaction. They plan to schedule additional public meetings in the fall.

Board Member Clarke reported that while going from the Post Office to his office, he noticed a City employee working in a flower bed on her hands and knees. She was very surprised when he thanked her for her service. She really appreciated someone noticing her efforts. He asked if the City has a mechanism for recognizing public employees for their fine service. Mr. Chave answered that they do not have a program to recognize public employees on a daily basis, but they do have an

**APPROVED**

annual meeting where service awards, etc. are given out. Board Member Clarke observed that the City of Edmonds is very unique and beautiful, and the citizens enjoy a lot of quality of life as a result of the City staff's efforts.

Board Member Johnson reported that she has enjoyed watching the three new murals being painted. They have been sponsored by the Edmonds Mural Society, and they have plans for two additional murals, as well.

Board Member Reed noted that August 10<sup>th</sup> was the City's 120<sup>th</sup> anniversary.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The Board meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

**APPROVED**