

APPROVED JANUARY 11TH

**CITY OF EDMONDS
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

December 14, 2011

Chair Lovell called the meeting of the Edmonds Planning Board to order at 7:04 p.m. in the Council Chambers, Public Safety Complex, 250 – 5th Avenue North.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Philip Lovell, Chair
John Reed, Vice Chair
Kevin Clarke
Kristiana Johnson
Neil Tibbott

STAFF PRESENT

Carrie Hite, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director
Renee McRae, Recreation Manager
Kernen Lien, Planner
Karin Noyes, Recorder

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT

Todd Cloutier (excused)
Valerie Stewart (excused)
Bill Ellis (excused)

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

VICE CHAIR REED MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 9, 2011 BE APPROVED AS AMENDED. BOARD MEMBER TIBBOTT SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS

Andy Eccleshall, Historic Preservation Commission, presented each of the Board Members with a copy of the 18-month calendar that was created by the Historic Preservation Commission. He advised that the calendar illustrates various historic sites and events in Edmonds. It is being offered to the public free of charge as a public outreach tool to raise awareness about historic preservation. Copies of the calendar can be obtained at City Hall, the library and the Edmonds Museum.

PUBLIC HEARING ON PLANNING BOARD'S PROCESS AND NAMING RECOMMENDATION FOR THE PARK AT THE OLD MILLTOWN SITE AT FIFTH AVENUE SOUTH AND MAPLE STREET

Ms. Hite advised that the purpose of the public hearing is to consider potential names for the new park that is currently under construction at Old Milltown. She reviewed that the park site was purchased by the City in 2008. In 2010 the Edmonds Floretum Garden Club agreed to develop and maintain the site in perpetuity, but this agreement was never signed and made official. When park staff met with representatives from the Garden Club in January 2011 to discuss the agreement further, the Garden Club informed them that they would be unable to fulfill their obligation. Subsequent conversations with members of the Garden Club indicated support for a design committee to move the project forward.

Ms. Hite explained that when she was hired by the City in January 2011, the City Council indicated a strong desire to get the Old Milltown Park constructed as a gateway for the downtown. The park is intended to be a gathering place for the community. She said she spent her first three months at the City meeting with members of the community to learn, listen and gather information. During this time, many concerns were voiced about the park at Old Mill Town, and these were identified at the City Council retreat in February. She also met with the City Council and the Planning Board in April, May and June to discuss the issue further. It was decided that the park should be redesigned to address the concerns. A design committee was formed, comprised of 20 members from the community, to prepare a new design proposal, which was presented to the City Council for final adoption in August of 2011.

Ms. Hite advised that the Floretum Garden Club has been the driving force behind the Old Mill Town Park project, and members of the group participated on the design committee and met with staff throughout the year to discuss their ideas and concerns. She emphasized that the City has every intention of recognizing their efforts at the park site, as well as the efforts of other individuals and groups who have contributed significantly to the project. The design calls for precast planters lining the front entry. These planters will be custom designed to provide space for plaques to recognize those who donated more than \$1,000.

Ms. Hite said it has been amazing to see the amount of community support that has come forward for the project. The estimated cost of the project is \$150,000, depending on the artistic elements that are incorporated into the design. This cost includes design work, demolition, permitting, utility work, grading, etc. She noted that a lot of work has been done in house to construct the raised bed garden formations. She specifically reviewed the more significant contributions as follows:

- The Floretum Garden Club provided \$12,000, of which \$2,000 was allocated for the purchase of a bench in memory of one of their members. The remaining \$10,000 is to be used for the plantings and the raised bed garden features.
- Edmonds in Bloom contributed \$4,000, and indicated their interest in supporting the garden features at the park.
- The Hubbard Family Foundation provided \$4,000 and indicated their interest in supporting artistic elements.
- The Edmonds Arts Festival Foundation also contributed \$4,000 to fund artistic features.
- The Edmonds Arts Commission provided \$2,000 for artistic features.
- Rebecca Wolfe contributed \$3,000 to purchase the drinking fountain in memory of her late husband.
- Two other individuals contributed \$2,000 to purchase benches for the park, as well.
- The Alliance of Citizens of Edmonds (ACE) contributed \$200, with a strong offer to help raise more money if needed.

Ms. Hite summarized that total revenues collected from individual and group donations to date are \$33,700. The City Council originally allocated \$40,000 for the project. However, because they had a strong interest in getting the project started, they allocated an additional \$70,000 from the Real Estate Excise Tax (REET) fund, on the contingent basis that City staff search for additional grant funding to support the project and replenish the REET fund. She noted that it is important to replenish the REET fund because it is the only capital fund for parks and there are several projects in queue for next year.

Ms. Hite explained that in accordance with the City's adopted Park Naming Policy, the Planning Board is required to conduct a public hearing and make a formal recommendation to the City Council. She specifically noted that one Park Naming Policy allows the City to name a park after an individual or organization that contributes significantly to the acquisition or development of the facility. She advised that the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services staff solicited name proposals, and a list of the 43 nominations received was forwarded to the Planning Board on November 22nd. She noted that 25 of the 43 nominations include the name "Hazel Miller" in some fashion, and about 25% of the nominations were for the specific name of "Hazel Miller Plaza."

Ms. Hite said Hazel Miller and her husband were long-time residents of Edmonds. Upon Ms. Miller's passing in 2009, she donated large amounts of money to several organizations, the largest of which was to create the Hazel Miller Foundation, which is dedicated to serving the citizens of Edmonds and South Snohomish County through programs and projects that serve the public's benefit, especially in the areas of education and youth services, poverty alleviation and hunger, civic and community services and amenities, the environment and culture and the arts. Ms. Hite reported that this fall, the Hazel Miller Foundation awarded the City of Edmonds an \$88,000 grant to develop the Old Milltown park site, contingent upon naming

the site as the "Hazel Miller Plaza." The Foundation's interest is to ensure the community recognizes Mrs. Miller as a vital member of the community, and naming the park after her represents an excellent opportunity to accomplish this goal.

Ms. Hite said both the staff and Mayor Earling are strongly recommending the Planning Board consider a recommendation to name the Old Milltown park site as the "Hazel Miller Plaza" to recognize Mrs. Miller's efforts to support Edmonds through contributions to both the City and South Snohomish County. Mayor Earling has indicated his strong support for the Hazel Miller Foundation.

Vice Chair Reed asked what the budget was at the time the new design was reviewed and approved by the City Council in July and August. Ms. Hite answered that the budget was \$125,000, plus an additional \$25,000 for utility work. In response to Board Member Johnson, Ms. Hite said that park acquisition costs were \$250,000. Board Member Johnson asked if the City considered the total cost of the park (acquisition and construction) when determining whether or not the Foundation's donation was significant enough to warrant naming the park "Hazel Miller Plaza." Ms. Hite replied that the Park Naming Policy actually says the City can name a park after an individual or organization that contributes significantly to the acquisition or development of the facility.

Chair Lovell asked if the park project is proceeding on budget at this time. Ms. Hite answered affirmatively. Chair Lovell asked about the anticipated completion date for construction. Ms. Hite answered that they have run into some issues with deteriorated boards and posts on the adjacent boardwalk, and this has caused a one-month delay in construction. They are now ready to proceed, and they are anticipating completion by the end of January.

Chair Lovell asked how the in-house work costs are being tracked. Ms. Hite answered that the materials purchased for the in-house work are funded by the project budget. While the labor hours are being tracked, they are not being charged as part of the project costs. She summarized that the total project budget is \$150,000, plus in-house labor. Chair Lovell asked if the project is expected to be completed within budget. Ms. Hite answered that she anticipates the project can be completed under budget. Chair Lovell stressed the importance of being up front with the citizens about the actual cost of the project, including in-house labor, so they can avoid the confusion that occurred with the Haines Park cost overruns.

Vice Chair Reed asked if the Floretum Garden Club is still making the commitment to maintain the park. Ms. Hite said representatives from the Garden Club have been working with the project's horticulturist to identify plantings for the garden areas. They will help plant the materials and maintain the gardens, but the City will be responsible to oversee the maintenance program in the future.

Board Member Clarke reminded the Board that their role as Parks Board is to be an advisory body to the City Council. The makeup of the City Council changes with each election. Because there has been confusion in the past, he suggested it would be good for the Board to carefully review the history of park naming in the City. He noted that this is the third park the City has named in the last three years, and no parks were named in the prior 20 years. He made the following observations:

- The majority of parks in the City are named after districts or the character of the site.
- Those parks that are named after individuals have generally been for historic figures in the community (i.e. Brackett, Yost, Hutt, etc.)
- Hutt Park was a donation of land with a specific name based on the deed restriction.
- Mathay Ballinger Park, located in the southeast corner of the City, is named after the George Mathay family, who owned a saw mill in the area where Scott's Restaurant is currently located. Their son built a subdivision on 79th Place West, and the property along the east side of the Interurban right-of-way was excess land the family owned and later donated to Snohomish County. A park was developed on the site, and the City eventually acquired the property as part of annexation.
- Recently, the City made a decision to rename a portion of the Pine Street Park Playfield after Mr. Myring, and a special plaque with his name was installed at the park.
- Hickman Park was the first park named after an individual who was living. While some concern was voiced, there was nothing in the park naming policy that requires that individuals must be deceased. The Planning Board, as part of their recommendation, named the play area after J.P. Patches. Also, a group raised funding to develop a sport

APPROVED

court at the park that was named after a young man from the community who had passed away. Small plaques were placed in both of these locations to recognize these two individuals.

- Haines Park was named after a historic family, but a portion of the park (the overlook) was also named after a former public servant, Chief David Stern. He emphasized that while there is a plaque in this location to memorialize Chief Stern, the park is not named after him.

Board Member Clarke said that after visiting numerous parks in the area, he appreciates the complexity of the park naming process, and he participated on the Board's park naming committee on two occasions. He expressed his belief that the City should eventually come up with a new name for the "mini park." Ms. Hite agreed to bring this issue forward in 2012.

Board Member Clarke referred to the Park Naming Policy and noted the criteria requires that multiple characteristics of a park be considered when deciding what to name it. He invited staff to share their thoughts about how to balance the conflicts between the generosity of citizens (individuals, groups, corporations, etc.) and the community's desire to name a park a particular name that does not incorporate the donor's name. Ms. Hite acknowledged that not only is this a struggle for the City, it has become a national struggle, as well. As park budgets become more and more constrained, governments are looking for revenue opportunities to support park services other than their general funds. Concepts such as concessions in parks, selling advertising space in parks and private donations are becoming more popular. When determining the correct balance, she tries to keep in mind the benefits and cost of each proposal to citizens of Edmonds. In the current case, the Hazel Miller Foundation has offered a significant donation to the community. Aside from the \$88,000, their presence in the community in the future is also very important. The park naming process ensures that the City obtains input from all interested citizens. The citizens were notified of the Foundation's generous offer in exchange for naming the park "Hazel Miller Plaza." However, the public also invited to provide input for other potential names for the park. She reminded the Board that the majority of nominations included Mrs. Miller's name in some form.

Ms. Hite advised that since the Staff Report was sent out, the City received two additional comments, both of which asked that the efforts of the Floretum Garden Club be recognized in some manner, which she agrees is important. She noted that the Garden Club previously was promised a plaque at the park to identify those who donated \$1,000 or more, and the City intends to honor this promise. However, staff is not proposing that the park be named after the Floretum Garden Club.

Board Member Clarke observed that most parks in the City have names that include three words, one of which typically refers to a geographic location. He asked a representative from the Hazel Miller Foundation to provide feedback about the Foundation's willingness to be flexible. He referred to the letter from the Foundation, which suggests that the Foundation should also be allowed to approve the park sign. He reminded the Board that the City has a sign standard for all parks, which includes not only the park name, but lists the various amenities that can be found at the park. Ms. Hite responded that the park sign would be consistent with the City's new sign design.

Ms. Hite explained that it is becoming increasingly difficult to adequately operate a park system without private donations because of budget cuts. It makes sense for the City to seek opportunities for donations and partnerships to help fund the park services.

Leigh Bennett, Edmonds, said he is a member of the Hazel Member Foundation Board. He thanked Ms. Hite for her great explanation of the Foundation's proposal. He referred to information he provided prior to the meeting regarding the history and mission of the Foundation. He specifically noted that Hazel Miller was a 30-year resident of Edmonds, and she loved the City. He advised that the Foundation was established upon Ms. Miller's death in 2010. In its nearly two full years of grant making, it has progressively increased its gift giving in the areas of education, youth services, poverty alleviation and hunger, civic and community services and amenities, the environment and culture and the arts totaling nearly \$500,000. In accordance with its mission, all recipients directly benefit the general population of Edmonds and South Snohomish County. In addition to the Foundation, Mrs. Miller also made significant donations in her will to the Seattle Children's Hospital Foundation, the Millionair Club charity, Fred Hutchison Cancer Research Center, and the Salvation Army.

Mr. Bennett advised that once fully operational, the Foundation will have between \$500,000 and \$600,000 to donate in Edmonds and South Snohomish County each year, and the Foundation will exist into perpetuity. He specifically noted that in its short life, the Foundation has provided financial support for the Edmonds 4th of July celebration, Edmonds Center for the

Arts, local food banks and scholarships for local school children. Again, he said the Foundation is dedicated to serving the citizens of Edmonds and South Snohomish County through programs and projects that serve the public benefit.

Mr. Bennett advised that in the summer of 2011, the City of Edmonds submitted a grant application for funding to develop the park at Old Milltown. Their initial request was for a small amount, but a subsequent application increased the grant request to \$88,000. As part of the application, staff indicated their willingness to help the Foundation through the park naming process if they were willing to donate more than half of the construction costs. He said the Foundation believes it is critical to have Mrs. Miller's name established in the City where she lived, and the park at Old Milltown represents an opportunity for them to accomplish this goal. It is important to the Foundation that Mrs. Miller's previous and future contributions to the community are acknowledged. They hope the Planning Board will recognize this need and recommend that the City Council approve the name "Hazel Miller Plaza."

Board Member Clarke observed that in his profession, he works with a number of high-net-worth families and foundations and everyone has a sensitivity associated with philanthropy. He asked if there is anything in the legal papers associated with Mrs. Miller's request that specifically asks that her name be attached to her contributions in any way. Mr. Bennett answered no. Board Member Clarke asked if Mrs. Miller's name was attached to her contributions to Seattle Children's Hospital, the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, the Salvation Army, etc. Mr. Bennett said he does not know the answer to this question, but he assumes that some recognition was provided for each of these donations.

Board Member Clarke referred to the Foundation's letter, which specifically states that their donation is contingent upon the City naming the park "Hazel Miller Plaza." He reminded the Board that the Park Naming Policy calls for a public hearing, a recommendation by the Planning Board, and then a final decision by the City Council. He asked if the Foundation would consider another name if that is the outcome of the park naming process. Mr. Bennett emphasized that the letter is clear that if the name "Hazel Miller Plaza" is not ultimately approved by the City Council, the Foundation would withdraw the grant funding. He explained that this issue was discussed at the recent Foundation Board meeting, and the Board unanimously felt it was important to stick with the name they originally suggested.

Board Member Clarke asked if the Foundation Board considered any of the other names that were nominated by the public. Mr. Bennett again stated that the Foundation Board believes the name they submitted is important for the foundation and the relationship they will have with the City of Edmonds in the future beyond this particular park, itself. While he acknowledged that the Board did not have a thorough discussion of all the names, he noted that more than half of the nominations included Mrs. Miller's name in some form, and about one quarter of them recommended "Hazel Miller Plaza." He emphasized that from the Foundation's standpoint, it is less about the money and more about where they are going in the future. They also carefully considered what Mrs. Miller would have wanted, and they agreed that she would have wanted to have her name on this particular park. He said the Foundation is not expecting her name to be placed every time money is donated, but they felt it was important to stick with their original request.

Board Member Clarke summarized the Foundation's position that if the City does not name the park "Hazel Miller Plaza," the Foundation will withdraw their grant offer. Mr. Bennett agreed that is the Foundation's position. Board Member Clarke asked if the Foundation would consider the option of adding to the name of the park, such as "Hazel Miller Plaza at Old Milltown." Mr. Bennett said that all on the Foundation Board agreed that they did not want to have additional names on the park. Board Member Clarke summarized that adding the location of the park as part of the name would be unacceptable to the Foundation. Mr. Bennett agreed and added that there is only one name the Foundation would support.

Chair Lovell emphasized that it is important to include input from other citizens as part of the record. He specifically referred to an email the Board received from Rich Senderoff just prior to the meeting asking that the Board consider the name "Hazel Miller Floretum Plaza." He recalled Ms. Hite's earlier comment that additional plaques would be placed at the park to recognize the contribution of the Floretum Club, as well as others who have contributed significantly to the park. Chair Lovell also referred to a memorandum the Board received from Board Member Stewart, indicating her support for including "Old Milltown" in the name. She also suggested that "plaza" would be better than "courtyard."

Board Member Tibbott asked if the Foundation would consider a contribution to a future project in the City as opposed to this particular park that is currently under construction. Mr. Bennett answered that if the City Council does not approve the name

APPROVED

“Hazel Miller Plaza,” there will likely be other opportunities. However, the Foundation is interested in placing Mrs. Miller’s name on a significant feature in the City, and they feel the park at Old Milltown fits well, given the size of the Foundation. Board Member Tibbott asked if it possible the Foundation would consider contributing an entire year’s funds to a City project in the future. Mr. Bennett answered that he is unable to make a commitment on behalf of the Foundation Board.

Board Member Tibbott pointed out that it could be a long time before the Foundation is able to establish a track record for contributions to the City of Edmonds. Mr. Bennett agreed that it will take a few more years for the Foundation to be fully operational. He emphasized that because the money must be spent in Edmonds and South Snohomish County, it is highly likely the Foundation will provide a significant benefit to the Edmonds community.

Board Member Tibbott asked Mr. Bennett to describe the Foundation’s mission and the types of contributions they have made and plan to make in the future. Mr. Bennett referred the Board to the Foundation’s website for a list of contributions that have been made, as well as information about future contributions. He reminded the Commission of his earlier comments about the types of projects and programs the Foundation will support. He summarized that, in its short span, the Foundation has given away more than \$500,000.

Board Member Tibbott asked how widely the City distributed their request for park name nominations. He said he was curious about why so many of the nominations included Hazel Miller’s name in some form. He asked if the nominations were submitted by individuals or groups. Ms. Hite answered that the request for park name nominations was announced to the public through local news organizations, and notification was also posted at the park. In addition, people approached staff to submit suggested names. She noted that individuals from one group, in particular, submitted the name “Hazel Miller Plaza.”

Board Member Tibbott expressed concern that the City’s outreach effort only netted 42 nominations, and one quarter of them were for the same name. Ms. Hite pointed out that the Foundation’s grant offer of \$88,000, as well as their proposed name for the park, was published in a news story. Board Member Tibbott pointed out that many people stated they were nominating “Hazel Miller Plaza” because it would save the City \$88,000. Board Member Clarke pointed out that Nominations 26 through 33 must have been submitted by people from the same group, since they all included the exact same reasons for their nomination. Board Member Tibbott said he would like to hear other reasons, besides the \$88,000 contribution, for naming the park after Mrs. Miller. He would also like to learn more about other contributions Mrs. Miller and/or the Foundation have made to the City of Edmonds. Ms. Hite noted that some of the nominations recognized Mrs. Miller as being an Edmonds benefactor and an outstanding person in the community. Mr. Bennett referred to his earlier comments in which he identified the programs and projects the Foundation has supported over the past few years. He also reminded the Board of the Foundation’s Mission Statement that outlines the types of programs and projects the Foundation supports (see earlier comments). In addition to the contributions mentioned earlier, he noted that the Foundation also awarded a grant to the Wade James Theater to redo their heating system.

Chair Lovell pointed out that because Mrs. Miller passed away less than two years ago, the Foundation has not had an opportunity to establish a lengthy track record. He referred to Nomination 23, which suggests the name “Hazel Miller Courtyard at Old Milltown.” The submitter stated that, not only would this name honor a citizen who set up a generous foundation to benefit Edmonds, it would also recognize the site’s history so it is not lost to future generations.

Vice Chair Reed recalled that the letter from the Foundation indicated they would like to have an opportunity to review and approve the design of the park sign. He asked if the Foundation Board has discussed what they would like to see on the sign. Mr. Bennett answered that the Foundation does not intend to deter from the City’s sign standards, but they would like an opportunity to review the sign design and location because it is intended to be a legacy for Mrs. Miller.

Vice Chair Reed asked if the Foundation would be amenable to naming the park “Hazel Miller Plaza at Old Milltown.”. Perhaps the park sign could also recognize those who contributed to the park significantly. Mr. Bennett emphasized that the Foundation is asking that the park be named Hazel Miller Plaza, and they do not believe it would be appropriate to add other names to the sign. Recognition of other individuals could be provided on a separate plaque, if desired.

Board Member Clarke pointed out that most other parks that are named after individuals on the national, state and local level use just the last name of the individual. This precedent is true in the City of Edmonds, as well. He noted that Hickman Park

APPROVED

is named after Dr. Robert O. Hickman, and there are numerous signs throughout the park that provide information about Dr. Hickman and his contribution to the community. He recalled that when the park was named, he specifically recommended that just Dr. Hickman's last name should be used to be consistent with other parks in Edmonds. He expressed his belief that most people would not want their name to become a controversy when they are trying to do something good. He expressed concern that naming the park "Hazel Miller Plaza" could set precedence for future situations. Mr. Bennett pointed out there is nothing in the Park Naming Policy that requires the City to use just the last name of an individual. He said that if the Board recommends "Miller Plaza" to the City Council they should do so with the understanding that the Foundation would likely withdraw their grant offer. Again, he reminded the Board that the grant is based on the Foundation's letter and the application that was submitted by the City. He emphasized that the Foundation did not approach the City first; the City requested the grant funding.

Ms. Hite confirmed that after discussions in July and August, the City Council allocated \$70,000 for park construction, with the caveat that staff would apply for grant funding. As a result, staff submitted several grant applications, including one to the Hazel Miller Foundation. Vice Chair Reed asked if the grant application stated that the City would name the park "Hazel Miller Plaza." Ms. Hite explained that the grant request was two-tiered. One request was for a lesser amount to support the project, and another was for over 50% of the construction costs, with the caveat that the City would go through the naming process to name the park "Hazel Miller Plaza." Vice Chair Reed said he is not opposed to including Mrs. Miller's first name as part of the park name.

Board Member Johnson summarized that the Foundation's letter makes it clear that their donation is contingent upon the park being named "Hazel Miller Plaza." She said she referred to the dictionary for definitions of "plaza" and "courtyard." A plaza is typically located in the center of town and is surrounded by shops. Historically, a courtyard was the center of the castle, but in modern times it is considered a three-sided area, which is consistent with the subject park area. She asked why the Foundation is set on using the word "plaza," rather than a more unique name. There is already a Library Plaza and a Century Plaza in downtown Edmonds. Mr. Bennett did not provide a response.

Board Member Clarke pointed out that the Park Naming Policy states that the Board should approach park naming with caution and deliberation, yet this is the first time the Board has heard the fact that they only have one option in relation to the generous contribution from the Hazel Miller Foundation. Mr. Bennett pointed out that the Foundation's letter made this stipulation very clear. Board Member Clarke agreed that the letter indicates the Foundation's desire that the park be named "Hazel Miller Plaza," but it does not specifically state that this must be the name of the park or the Foundation would withdraw their grant offer. Mr. Bennett specifically referenced to the following statements from the Foundation's letter:

- "We are excited at the prospect of having this park named the "Hazel Miller Plaza," and have allocated \$88,000 should this name be chosen."
- "Before we fully confirm this grant, it is necessary that the City Council approves the name "Hazel Miller Plaza" for this project."

Vice Chair Reed said his interpretation of the letter is that the name "Hazel Miller Plaza" must be approved by the City Council before the grant funding would be confirmed. Board Member Clarke said the letter does not specifically state that the Foundation would not consider any other name. Vice Chair Reed emphasized that the Foundation Board has decided that the name must be "Hazel Miller Plaza" or the grant will not be funded. The Foundation Board's next meeting is not until February, and staff has indicated the project will be completed by the end of January.

Chair Lovell asked if the City Council is aware of the ramifications of the letter. Ms. Hite answered that the City Council is aware that the grant funding is contingent upon the Foundation's recommended park name. She agreed to make it clear to the City Council that the Hazel Miller Foundation Board has decided there is no flexibility in the park name if the City wants to obtain the grant funding.

Board Member Tibbott pointed out that although the Foundation has offered a grant that is contingent upon a certain name, the City should not circumvent the process outlined in the Park Naming Policy. They should consider all of the nominations that were submitted. The Board should not feel obligated to forward a recommendation that the park be named as per the Foundation's request.

APPROVED

Polly Peterson, Edmonds, said she did not find out about the park naming contest until she walked by the park area on the deadline day. She said she worked at Old Milltown in the 1970s and 1980s. She is familiar with the park area, which was a source of pleasure for many people as a central gathering place. She noted that the majority of the nominations contained some form of Mrs. Miller's name. She questioned whether the public was adequately notified of the opportunity to submit nominations, or if the majority of the nominations came from people who are familiar with the Foundation's grant offer. She cautioned against naming the park based solely on the \$88,000 promised by the Foundation. The Foundation can find other things to do with their money. She noted that the Foundation's website indicates that "Hazel Miller Plaza" has already been approved as the name for the park. She questioned the need for nominations if the name had already been decided.

Board Member Johnson asked if Ms. Peterson nominated a potential park name. Ms. Peterson answered that she recommended the name Rachel Setchfield Park. She recalled that Ms. Setchfield spent a lot of time in the area and gave so much pleasure to people while she worked at Old Milltown. She said she also thought about nominating the Floretum Garden Club as a potential name for the park. She said she grew up in Edmonds and the ladies in the Garden Club spent hours trying to beautify the community as volunteers. Board Member Johnson referred to an article she obtained about Ms. Setchfield, which describes how she contributed to the maintenance of the gardens.

Board Member Johnson thanked Ms. Peterson for sharing her thoughts. She reminded the public that the Planning Board is required to conduct an open public hearing before forwarding a recommendation to the City Council. It is important that everyone has an opportunity to contribute and be considered.

Board Member Clarke referred to an email the Board received, which contained an article about Rachel Setchfield from *THE ENTERPRISE* dated March 22, 1978. He said the Board also received an email from Betty Larman, which provided additional background on the Floretum Garden Club's activity and contribution. Her email also outlines her conversations with the City's former Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director, Brian McIntosh, about recognizing the contributions of the Garden Club. He said it appears the City plans to provide a plaque to honor their previous commitment to recognize the contributions of Garden Club members. Ms. Hite advised that the Garden Club also contributed \$2,000 to purchase a bench in memory of Rachel Setchfield.

Board Member Clarke read Board Member Stewart's written comment into the record as follows:

"When considering the criteria for park naming, I would like to draw attention to Items A and E in the Park Naming Policy. A refers to the geographic location, and E refers to an individual or organization that contributed significantly to the acquisition or development of the facility. I wanted to note Nomination 23: Hazel Miller Courtyard at Old Milltown. This nomination takes care of both A and E. So does Nomination 39: the Old Milltown Hazel Miller Plaza. In looking up the definition, plaza is described as a public square, usually paved between a building and a street. A courtyard is open space surrounded by walls or buildings. It sounds to me like "plaza" is a better term to use here. I do think it's important to recognize the historical significance of the place along with the donor."

Board Member Tibbott said he feels it is important to recognize and perhaps save some of the historical significance of the site for future generations. Ms. Hite noted that historic elements would be incorporated into the park design, and there is a lot of research going back to when the site was owned by the Yost family and operated as a garage. Board Member Johnson said she saw a picture of the site just prior to when it was developed. The space between the road and the building used to be a driveway to an old filling station.

Board Member Tibbott suggested that perhaps the name "Old Milltown" does not accurately depict the history of the site. It might be more accurate to call it the "old repair station or garage." Board Member Johnson suggested it is a matter of perception. For example, Betty Larman has commented that Old Milltown is significant because it was developed in the 1970's and designed by a noted architect. In addition, most people in the City know where Old Milltown is located, but they may not know that the site was previously the home of Yost Garage.

Board Member Clarke referred to an email the Board received from Jean Richards expressing opposition to naming the park in honor of a person, either past or present. Board Member Johnson also noted an email the Board received from Rich

Senderoff dated December 14th asking that the Board consider the name “Hazel Miller Floretum Plaza” and an email from Betty Larman dated November 14th recounting the history of the site, the significant involvement of the Floretum Garden Club, and some of the fund raising facts associated with the property acquisition.

Board Member Clarke pointed out that the last paragraph in the Park Naming Policy states that “parks and facilities named after individuals shall not be changed unless it is found that because of the individual’s character, the continued use of the name would not be in the best interest of the community.” He said that, in his opinion, this paragraph would not be applicable to the Hazel Miller, so the name would stay the same in perpetuity.

Board Member Tibbott asked what other names the Board could consider besides “Hazel Miller Plaza.” Board Member Johnson answered that the Board should consider all of the nominations that were submitted prior to the deadline. She said that when staff presents the Board’s recommendation to the City Council, they will likely be asked about the process. She questioned the process of inviting the public to participate, knowing there is an offer on the table for a specific name. She questioned how the Board could reconcile the process to ensure it is transparent. Ms. Hite said the City tried to make the Hazel Miller Foundation’s offer clear in the information that was published regarding the park naming process. Chair Lovell added that an advertisement was placed in the local news media inviting the public to nominate potential names and participate in the public hearing. Ms. Hite said a press release was also issued by City staff on October 26th to inform the public that the Foundation has requested the name “Hazel Miller Plaza.”

Board Member Clarke commented that while the policy also calls for a parking naming contest, there is actually no contest and no prizes are awarded. He suggested they eliminate the word “contest” to make the process more clear.

Board Member Johnson said the Board has received numerous emails and reports regarding the issue and has not had an opportunity to thoroughly review each one. She particularly referred to an October 21, 2010 proposed submittal by the Floretum Garden Club, which was part of another opportunity for grant funding through the Washington State Federation of Garden Clubs. It recommends the name “Old Milltown Garden.” She said it is important that Board Members have an opportunity to review all available information before making a recommendation to the City Council. She commented that the Board Members owe it to themselves to be fully informed so they can provide background information and history to support their recommendation. It is also important that all available information is provided to the City Council as part of the public record.

In answer to Vice Chair Reed, Ms. Hite clarified that the City Council is not required to conduct a public hearing before making a final decision. This responsibility is given to the Planning Board. However, the City Council can choose to have a public hearing if they find it appropriate.

Vice Chair Reed suggested the Board forward a recommendation to the City Council that is consistent with the funding request from the Hazel Miller Foundation, and then supplement their recommendation with alternative names and suggestions for obtaining funding if they do not accept the Foundation’s offer. They could also recommend that the park include visible recognition of others who have made significant contributions to the park’s existence.

Board Member Johnson said she would support any name that includes “Hazel Miller.” She said she would not be opposed to using Mrs. Miller’s full name if that is the desire of the Foundation. Board Member Tibbott, on the other hand, said he struggles with using the full name of a citizen who is not widely known throughout the community. At this point, the Foundation’s work is just emerging, and he would prefer to see a track record for the types of contributions they have made and will make in the community before naming a park after Mrs. Miller in perpetuity. Once this track record has been established and the mission of the Foundation is better understood, he would be more in favor of the Foundation’s request to name a park after Mrs. Miller.

Board Member Johnson said she is aware of the many good works performed by the Foundation to date, and they will continue to have a significant amount of money to invest in South Snohomish County, particularly Edmonds. One reason for the Foundation’s request to name the park “Hazel Miller Plaza” is to give recognition to the contributions the foundation will make in the future. Board Member Tibbott said he understands the Foundation’s intent, and if a track record had already been established, it would be easier for him to support the proposed name. He said he would prefer the park name to reflect the

history of the site and the significance of its location. If the City chooses not to name the park “Hazel Miller Plaza” as requested by the Foundation, perhaps there will be other opportunities in the future for the City to work with the Foundation.

Board Member Clarke referred to Nomination 11, which recommends the name “Rick Steves Park” because of Mr. Steve’s profound contribution to the community. He noted that Mr. Steves recently announced his long-term commitment to financially contribute to the Edmonds Center for the Arts. He draws numerous people to the community to attend his events, and he has made it well known that he lives in and appreciates Edmonds. He suggested it would be appropriate to provide some type of recognition for Mr. Steves at the Edmonds Center for the Arts.

Board Member Clarke also referred to Nomination 42, which recommends the name “John Byron Beck Municipal Park.” The nomination indicates that Mr. Beck was a long-standing member of the community, serving as a Washington State Legislator. He was a local businessman and past president of the Chamber of Commerce. He was also one of the founders of the Bank of Edmonds.

While the Foundation’s gift to the community would be significant, Board Member Clarke suggested the Board has an obligation to consider all the submitted nominations. He said he has lived in Edmonds all his life. While things have changed, some things, such as Old Milltown, have remained constant. Although it has no relationship to a mill, it has become a historic site that is recognized by the citizens of Edmonds. If the park were named “Hazel Miller Plaza at Old Milltown,” everyone in the City would know exactly where it is located. Adding Old Milltown to the name would be positive and would not take away from the name of Hazel Miller.

Chair Lovell recommended the Board continue their discussion to a future meeting so they could move on with the remainder of their agenda. This would allow the Board Members to review the additional information and obtain input from the Foundation about what other names they might be willing to consider.

BOARD MEMBER REED MOVED THAT THE BOARD CONTINUE THE PUBLIC HEARING TO JANUARY 11, 2012 FOR ADDITIONAL PUBLIC TESTIMONY AND CONTINUED BOARD DELIBERATION. BOARD MEMBER TIBBOTT SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

THE BOARD RECESSED THE MEETING AT 9:25 FOR A SHORT BREAK. THE MEETING WAS RECONVENED AT 9:34 P.M.

CITY OF EDMONDS SHORELINE MASTER PROGRAM UPDATE

Mr. Lien advised that Bob McChesney, Port of Edmonds Executive Director, was present to share the Port’s plans for their Harbor Square Master Plan and to make sure it is consistent with the City’s Shoreline Master Program (SMP) update. He explained that the Port’s Harbor Square Master Plan has progressed to the point where they might be able to slow the SMP update process until the Port has submitted their application for a Comprehensive Plan amendment to incorporate their new master plan.

Mr. McChesney recalled that he has spoken to the Board on previous occasions regarding the Port’s Harbor Square Redevelopment Master Plan process. He emphasized that no preferred alternative has been identified at this point. The plans are still at the conceptual level. A feasibility study (Phase 1) was done in 2009 and was followed by a public outreach program (Phase 2) that was completed in June 2011 with the help of a community steering committee. A draft report has been prepared and will be circulated to the public in January.

Mr. McChesney reported that the Port is working closely with the City to coordinate their process with the SMP update. He referred to a letter the Port received from the Department of Ecology (DOE) that endorses the Port’s process. In addition, the Port has been working with Friends of the Edmonds Marsh to address concerns related to the marsh. From the Port’s point of view, they need to finalize their public outreach phase by circulating the report to every residential address in Edmonds and Woodway. The next step is for the Port to engage in a State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review process that will become the enabling document for the Port Commission to adopt the concepts into the Port’s Master Plan. They expect these steps to occur during the first quarter of 2012, which will enable the Port to present a Comprehensive Plan amendment request

APPROVED

to the City for consideration by the Planning Board and City Council. Once the master redevelopment plan has been adopted into the City's Comprehensive Plan, the Port can engage in discussions having to do with a future development agreement that addresses issues such as traffic, design, site configuration, etc. Mr. McChesney summarized that the Port believes it is time to move forward with the master plan. City and Port staff have worked together to ensure that the Harbor Square Redevelopment Plan and the SMP move forward in sync.

Board Member Johnson asked Mr. McChesney to clarify the Port's plans for disseminating the report. Mr. McChesney answered that the Port Commission believes it is absolutely vital to send the report to all residential addresses in Edmonds and Woodway. They will be asking the City for approval, so everyone in the City should have an opportunity to understand what the Port is proposing. Board Member Reed asked if the public would have an opportunity to comment on the report. Mr. McChesney replied that there will be opportunities for additional public comment during the 30-day comment period for SEPA, and he anticipates public hearings would also be conducted by both the Planning Board and the City Council before the Comprehensive Plan amendment is adopted.

Chair Lovell asked Mr. McChesney to describe the Port's anticipated timeline for completing the process. Mr. McChesney said the Port wants to be ready to submit a Comprehensive Plan amendment proposal to the Planning Board and City Council during the second quarter of 2012. This will allow them three months at the beginning of 2012 to complete the SEPA review and for the Port Commission to approve the Harbor Square Redevelopment Plan as part of their overall Master Plan.

Board Member Johnson reminded Mr. McChesney that the City will embark on a Strategic Planning process in January 2012. She asked how the Port would coordinate their work with the City's Strategic Plan work. Mr. McChesney said the Port will attempt to coordinate their Harbor Square Redevelopment Plan process with the City's Strategic Plan process. He said he believes the Harbor Square Redevelopment Master Plan process will be complimentary and illustrative of a good planning process in general. In fact, it could become a module or part of the Strategic Plan, if only by reference. He said the Port has also tried to follow some contemporary planning guidance to incorporate form-based zoning as part of their master plan concept. He summarized that although the Port's plan might move slightly ahead of the Strategic Plan, they will not conflict with each other and will, in fact, be very complimentary.

Chair Lovell said the Economic Development Commission has suggested that perhaps the City would look to the Port to develop a similar study relative to the remainder of the waterfront, using the same type of process that was used for Five Corners and Westgate. The Strategic Plan process has been restructured so the timing will be fairly consistent with the Port's time frame for completing their Master Plan. He explained that not only would the Strategic Plan identify a vision for the City, a strategic plan guides near-term project progress towards achieving long-term visions. These goals will include the marsh, drainage problems on Dayton Street, access to the waterfront over the railroad tracks, etc. While it would be optimal to work concurrently on the SMP and the Strategic Plan to ensure the two documents are consistent, the State has identified a deadline for completing the SMP update. Mr. Lien advised that the SMP update must be completed in 2012. He reminded the Board of their previous discussion about bumping back the SMP update schedule a few months. They originally anticipated the first public hearing before the Planning Board on March 14th, but perhaps it would be appropriate to postpone the public hearing until after the Port has submitted their Comprehensive Plan amendment in May or June.

Chair Lovell reminded the Board that at their last meeting, they reviewed a memorandum from staff that outlined the issues for which they are seeking additional direction from the Board. One issue was related to the proposed new Urban Mixed Use III designation. The Board agreed it would be appropriate to continue their discussion to a future meeting to seek additional input from the Port of Edmonds about the new designation would impact their proposed Harbor Square Redevelopment Master Plan. They were particularly interested in feedback about how the proposed parking setback requirements. Because of the lateness of the hour, he suggested the Board continue their discussion to the January 25th meeting. He suggested the public hearing be postponed until May or June, after the Port has submitted their master plan proposal.

Board Member Johnson asked if the Port is going to complete the SEPA review before distributing the report. Mr. McChesney answered that the two activities would occur simultaneously. He further advised that the SEPA review would be completed before the Port's Comprehensive Plan amendment proposal is submitted to the Planning Board for review. The Port Commission will approve the master plan prior to submitting the document to the City, as well.

APPROVED

Vice Chair Reed recalled that there has been some discussion about liquefaction issues at the Antique Mall site, and this could impact what can and cannot be developed. It could also impact the costs associated with redevelopment. He suggested that this problem might also be applicable to the Harbor Square site. He cautioned against creating grand plans that involve three to five-story structures that may not be feasible due to existing soil conditions. These issues must be resolved prior to redevelopment, and he encouraged the Port to make sure the issue is considered as part of their master plan discussion.

Chair Lovell agreed it could be an engineering challenge to develop these two sites, but it could be done with pilings, etc. He referred to the soils study that was completed for the Senior Center site, which talks about liquefaction. It indicates that the risk is very slight. He suggested that the water table would be the largest challenge, particularly when considering below-grade construction. Mr. McChesney agreed these issues need to be thoroughly reviewed, but he cautioned that the Port is still in the conceptual stage. They are proceeding with the assumption that because there are buildings on the site now, there is reason to believe they will be able to build as needed. However, he acknowledged that the Port will need to do a thorough evaluation at some point in the future.

Board Member Johnson asked if financial feasibility would be part of the SEPA review. Mr. McChesney answered that it would not be a direct part of the review. However, there are realities and constraints that must be considered. The Port is trying to abide by the imperative that the master plan must be economically feasible based on the reasonable assumptions that were presented to the Port Commission.

Board Member Johnson acknowledged that given enough money, a developer could resolve most engineering challenges to enable development to occur almost anywhere. However, because of water table and liquefaction issues, she felt it would be appropriate for the Port to conduct additional analysis. Mr. McChesney said the Port will be unable to address these issues until the requirements have been established. He recalled that in past discussions with the Board, he has mentioned that the Port's approach to redevelopment at Harbor Square is different than that of a private sector developer. A private sector developer would likely attempt to optimize the economic opportunity and massing on the parcel. The Port's goal is to determine the minimum amount of development that must occur on the site to be economically feasible. The Port's feasibility study identifies the constraints, assumptions and realities. However, the Port does not know in real time when redevelopment will occur and market factors will also determine what is economically feasible. He said the Port does not anticipate redeveloping the site, itself. Their goal is to perfect a concept and achieve the necessary entitlements so they can engage the private sector to do the actual development. The Port has limited resources but a fair amount of expertise in master planning. The Commission does not have an appetite for investing in building construction, but they think it is appropriate for the Port to lead the process to obtain the necessary entitlements that will express what is in the best interest of the community.

Board Member Clarke expressed his professional opinion that because the Port does not have an adequate analysis to identify existing soil conditions and the water table, the financial feasibility study is misleading. The study merely represents preliminary cost numbers that do not take into consideration the soil on the site. He expressed his belief that these issues must be clearly defined, quantified and addressed as part of the feasibility study. Mr. McChesney explained that the feasibility study is intended to be a bulk analysis that identifies how much mass is needed on the parcel to be economically feasible. While Board Member Clarke's points are well taken, the Port's thought was that this level of analysis would not be necessary for what they are trying to achieve in this phase of the process. The Port would address the more detailed, site-specific constraints and issues as part of the next phase of the project. Board Member Clarke commented that this approach would be appropriate for almost any site in the City, with the exception of those along the waterfront because of known issues related to the water table and liquefaction. He said the reality is that an architect cannot design a building unless he/she knows what the soils are on the site. This information is critical to an overall plan.

Board Member Johnson pointed out that the sewer treatment plant was constructed after Harbor Square was developed. She suggested the Port obtain copies of the studies that were done for that site, since the soil conditions would probably closely resemble those at Harbor Square.

Mr. McChesney summarized that the Board provided some good comments. The Port wants to learn and understand in advance what the Board's concerns will be, and they will try to answer them to the extent possible. He said it did not occur to the Port that this high level of detail would be an important part of the Comprehensive Plan amendment. Board Member Johnson noted that the marsh and its environment will be important elements of the Comprehensive Plan amendment. She

APPROVED

recalled that at their last discussion, the Board was not quite sure about the appropriate distance that should be required from the edge of the marsh and potential buildings and parking areas. The Board was interested to learn how different setback standards would compliment or interfere with the Port's plans. Based on discussions with staff, Mr. McChesney said he believes the Port's master plan is tracking well with the City's SMP update. The Port has also been working with Friends of the Edmonds Marsh and the DOE. It appears as though the buffers and setbacks contemplated would be perfectly adequate and even better than what might be expected.

Mr. McChesney explained that redevelopment of Harbor Square and restoration of the marsh are neither mutually exclusive nor incompatible. In fact, the two depend on each other. Redevelopment of Harbor Square creates opportunities for restoring the marsh, including improvements to stormwater, enhanced buffers, and daylighting Willow Creek. All of these projects work together. It is important to find the best way to redevelop Harbor Square to the benefit of the community, including marsh restoration.

Board Member Johnson said the Board has expressed an interest in learning how the marsh would be impacted if Willow Creek were daylighted or the flood gate were left open. However, this data is apparently not available. Mr. McChesney said there are grant funding opportunities to complete a baseline conditions survey and explore future opportunities in more detail. Mr. Lien added that policies were added to the SMP to prioritize studies related to the marsh. In addition, the City has received grant funding to study the marsh. Board Member Johnson asked how restoration of the marsh would impact the 200-foot area of the shoreline jurisdiction. Mr. Lien referred to Revised Code of Washington 90.58.580, which says that if a restoration project alters the ordinary high water mark or shoreline location, the new property that is now within the shoreline jurisdiction can get relief from the regulations. It is important that people are not discouraged from doing restoration projects.

Board Member Clarke asked if the SMP includes setback requirements related to the railroad right-of-way for pedestrian activity and building improvements. He suggested it might be appropriate to require a setback to account for situations such as train derailment. Mr. Lien answered that the State does not require setbacks from the railroad right-of-way, and the issue is not addressed in the City's draft SMP. He noted that the majority of the railroad is located outside of the shoreline jurisdiction. Chair Lovell suggested this is a railroad safety issue rather than a shoreline issue. He expressed his belief that requiring buffers for potential accidents along the railroad rights-of-ways would not be the highest and best use of land. Board Member Clarke pointed out that a railroad disaster would not only impact the railroad right-of-way but adjacent private property, as well.

Board Member Johnson asked if the City knows the extent of the restoration project at this time. Mr. Lien answered that the City would not know the extent of the restoration until a project proposal comes forward. Board Member Johnson asked if this would be part of the Port's Harbor Square Redevelopment Master Plan proposal. Mr. McChesney answered that it would not because a project has not been defined yet, and they do not know enough about what the final outcome should be. He emphasized that the Port is committed to participating in the process as much as possible.

Keeley O'Connell, Friends of the Edmonds Marsh, explained that they do not know what the extent of the restoration will be at this time. People for Puget Sound was just awarded a grant from the Salmon Recovery Funding Board through Water Resource Inventory Area (WRIA) 8 that will initiate a feasibility study. She explained that because of constrained funding situations, there are significant restrictions on what the money can be used for. It can be used to define the area that will become salt marsh and what the average tidal cycle will be and how it relates to juvenile Chinook foraging success. If it can be shown there will be juvenile Chinook foraging over a certain amount of time, they will be allowed to continue to accept funding requests to carry the project forward into design, permitting, construction and monitoring post construction. They have ideas for what they think needs to happen and what the constraints are. They also know where they have opportunities to change the constraints and where they cannot significantly change the constraints. For example, they understand that they cannot change the Harbor Square site back into a marsh.

Ms. O'Connell explained that Friends of the Edmonds Marsh must work closely with the City staff to address issues related to stormwater coming into the system. However, the current grant funding cannot be used for this purpose. It will be used to specifically determine how much water would come in on average if they were to open the creek channel directly to Puget Sound and how much of the salt water marsh would be converted to fresh water marsh. They expect that the tidal affects

would expand. She explained that the ordinary high water mark on the north side of the marsh that abuts Harbor Square and is right up to the levy would not change. Addressing the flooding issues will be part of future studies.

Board Member Johnson summarized that the anticipated study will focus on how opening the creek channel will impact salinity, high water marks, and tides related to juvenile Chinook foraging. She asked for more information about how the creek channel would be opened. Ms. O'Connell answered that the main constraint is the long narrow pipe that limits the amount of water that can get into the system on a daily basis. In addition, there is a tide gate that is only open for a portion of the year. It is closed during the winter months so that only fresh water enters the marsh. An ideal situation would be a channel connection that takes the water out of the pipe and into the natural stream bank. They expect to see much more salt water coming into the marsh on a daily basis, but the need for a tide gate is still unknown. It may be that the only way to address flooding is to have a gate system, but it must be a smart gate that would not have to be locked shut for several months a year.

Board Member Johnson asked Ms. O'Connell to clarify her earlier comment about the levy on the north side of the marsh along the Harbor Square property. Ms. O'Connell explained that while they expect more water in the marsh, they do not expect to remove portions of developed land and covert it back to marsh. There are some constraints that can be addressed such as the pipe and the lack of tide water getting into the marsh. However, the reality is that Harbor Square is built out and they are not trying to convert it back to marsh. Instead, they need to figure out how to make redevelopment happen so that it is not harmful and actually enhances the marsh.

Board Member Johnson asked the time frame for the study. Ms. O'Connell answered that the study will take between 12 and 18 months to complete. There are two proposals currently on the table to bring additional funding from the City to support the grant funding received from the Salmon Recovery Funding Board so that stormwater issues can be addressed. These studies could be done simultaneously.

Board Member Johnson said it is important to clearly understand the constraints of the marsh and how it fits into the timing of the SMP. However, she observed that the study information will not be available before the City is required to adopt their updated SMP.

Ms. O'Connell clarified that the marsh stops wherever there is a levy or dyke. Any water coming out of the marsh going over the dyke is considered flooding, which is a public issue. Friends of the Edmonds Marsh has an interest in restoring what remains of the marsh to the best of their ability, working with the current constraints of the built out urban environment. They expect to see changes in the future in the types of vegetation and wildlife present at the marsh, but they would not expect changes in the integrity of the dyke system.

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

Chair Lovell agreed to email the Board Members his thoughts and ideas for issues that are scheduled to come before the Board in early 2012.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

Chair Lovell did not provide any comments during this portion of the meeting.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Board Member Johnson announced that the Economic Development Commission cancelled their December 21st meeting due to the holiday.

ADJOURNMENT

The Board meeting was adjourned at 10:37 p.m.

APPROVED