

APPROVED MARCH 28, 2012

**CITY OF EDMONDS
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

February 8, 2012

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 – 5th Avenue North.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Philip Lovell, Chair
Valerie Stewart, Vice Chair
Kevin Clarke
Kristiana Johnson
Neil Tibbott (arrived at 7:13 p.m.)
Bill Ellis

STAFF PRESENT

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager
Kernen Lien, Planner
Karin Noyes, Recorder

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT

John Reed
Todd Cloutier

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER ELLIS MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 25, 2012 BE APPROVED AS AMENDED. VICE CHAIR STEWART SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS

There was no one in the audience.

DISCUSSION ON UPDATING THE EDMONDS CITY CODE (ECC) AND EDMONDS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE (ECDC) TO ALLOW MOTORIZED MOBILE VENDORS (FILE NUMBER AMD 20100012)

Mr. Lien advised that the City continues to receive requests from persons who wish to operate motorized mobile vending (MMV) services within the City. However, there is currently confusing and conflicting language within the Edmonds City Code (ECC) and the Edmonds Community Development Code (ECDC) as to whether they are allowed in the City. He explained that ECC 4.12 provides the framework for licensing peddlers, solicitors and street vendors. While MMVs fit within the broad definition of “solicitor” in that they sell goods from place to place, they do not fit in the more narrow definition of street vendor, which refers to non-motorized mobile vending units such as hot dog carts. Under the definitions in ECC 4.12, an MMV may operate under a solicitor’s license obtained from the City Clerk. However, ECDC 16 requires that all uses within commercial zones be carried on within a completely enclosed building, with some exceptions depending on the zone. ECDC 21.10 defines a building as any structure having a roof, excluding all forms of vehicles even though

immobilized. He concluded that while a MMV may be allowed to operate under a solicitor's license, the areas they would most likely locate restrict the use to buildings only.

Mr. Lien said on July 19, 2011, the City Council directed staff to update relevant sections of the ECC and ECDC to make it clear that MMV units are permitted within the City of Edmonds. The City Attorney drafted changes to ECC 4.12 to specifically allow motorized mobile vendors. However, amendments must also be made to ECDC 16 to resolve conflicts, and these amendments must be reviewed by the Planning Board. He explained that while the Planning Board would not normally review changes to the ECC, there is a significant overlap between allowing MMV units in ECC 4.12 and how that use relates to other provisions within the ECDC. Therefore, staff believes that Board review of both the amendments to the ECC and the ECDC is warranted.

Mr. Lien referred the Board to the proposed amendments to ECC 4.12 (Attachment 3) and reviewed each one as follows:

- **ECC 4.12.010.B** – This section was highlighted because the City may want to designate different allowable zoning for motorized versus non-motorized vending units. In addition, it might be appropriate to add some or all of the new commercial zones that have been created in recent years.
- **ECC 4.12.010.C** – This section was modified to provide a definition for both “motorized mobile vending units” and “non-motorized mobile vending units.”
- **ECC 4.12.055** – The language throughout this section was changed to indicate that it applies to both motorized and non-motorized mobile vending units.
- **ECC 4.12.055.A** – If Architectural Design Board (ADB) approval is required for motorized and non-motorized mobile vending units, the code should provide criteria by which the ADB can base their review. Staff recommends that this section be deleted and that no design review be required.
- **ECC 4.12.055.D** – As currently proposed, no portion of the vendor's inventory, sales equipment or any other structure or equipment can be left overnight. The Board may want to consider allowing motorized mobile vending units to remain overnight in certain locations.
- **ECC 4.12.055.G** – As currently written, this provision prohibits street vendors from locating within the portion of improved street right-of-way designed for vehicular traffic or parking. This section could be revised to allow MMVs to locate in the right-of-way and/or in parking lots across parking spaces. However, the City may want to require that the overall site still complies with the required number of parking stalls for the existing business.
- **ECC 4.12.055.J** – This provision currently prohibits street vendors from occupying parking spaces on City property or in improved City rights-of-way reserved for vehicular traffic, parking or other transportation. The City may want to allow MMVs to parking next to the sidewalk in the downtown area and near the waterfront, so people can be served from the sidewalk.
- **ECC 4.12.055** – This section identifies the maximum permissible size of a mobile vending unit. The language may need to be updated to accommodate current dimensions of an MMV. Staff plans to visit sites and conduct additional research to identify more appropriate dimension limitations.

Mr. Lien summarized that the City Attorney's proposed changes to ECC 4.12 are minimal to make it clear that MMVs would be allowed. In order to make the ECDC consistent with the proposed amendments to ECC 4:12, staff is recommending that ECDC 16 be amended to accurately identify the commercial zones in which MMVs would be allowed.

Mr. Lien referred to ECC 4.12.010.B and explained that additional commercial zones have been created since the current ordinance was adopted. He asked the Board to provide direction as to whether or not MMVs should also be allowed in the Downtown Business (BD) zone, the Firdale Village Mixed-Use (MU-FV) zone, and the Business Commercial Edmonds Way (EW-BD) zone.

Mr. Chave advised that staff reviewed code language from other jurisdictions and found that regulations vary. Some jurisdictions encourage MMVs in all commercial zones; others allow them, but limit where they can be located. Some allow them only in designated areas. He noted that restaurants with fixed locations can become concerned if MMVs are allowed to operate close to their businesses. It is difficult for them to compete with MMVs because they have to account for overhead costs that MMVs do not have. Mr. Lien added that the City of Seattle's code language limits how close an MMV can be located to an existing restaurant.

Chair Lovell asked if the proposed amendments are associated with the amendments proposed by the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director to allow concession vendors in parks as an additional source of revenue for the City. Mr. Lien answered that the two issues are somewhat related and were presented to the City Council at the same time. However, the concession vendor amendments have already been approved by the City Council because no development code amendment was required. He reminded the Board of the City Council's charge to amend both the ECC and the ECDC to make it clear that MMVs are allowed in the City's commercial zones. Again, he explained that the Board does not typically review ECC amendments. However, because an ECDC amendment is also necessary, the Board has been asked to hold a public hearing and make a recommendation to the City Council on both items.

Mr. Chave advised that the issue of MMVs has come up numerous times related to coffee locations. The current code does not allow carts and trailers, and the solution has been to place a skirting around the structure to make it look like a small building. However, many potential MMV operators have not been interested in pursuing this approach.

Mr. Lien referred to the bulleted list of questions (see Staff Report) that were initially presented to the City Council and suggested this would be an appropriate place for the Board to start their discussion. He said staff is particularly seeking direction about which commercial zones would be appropriate for MMVs. For example, does the Board believe it would be appropriate to allow MMVs in the BD zones? Vice Chair Stewart reminded the Board that the BD1 zone talks about promoting restaurants. She expressed her opinion that allowing MMVs in this district could harm the restaurant businesses. She said she is opposed to allowing MMVs in the BD1 zone, but she would support the use in all other commercial zones as long as they are regulated appropriately. She said that, typically, a solicitor's license requires a background check, and vendors are required to display their licenses. Mr. Lien agreed that a background check would be conducted prior to issuance of a solicitor's license.

Board Member Clarke asked if the code would adequately address traffic flow and safety issues associated with MMVs locating in parking lots. Mr. Lien agreed that this is an important aspect to address. It is also important to ensure that MMVs and their customers do not take up parking space that is necessary for the business to meet code requirements. Mr. Chave advised that both of these issues would likely be addressed as part of the solicitor's licensing process. The applicant would have to identify a proposed location and provide a circulation plan. MMV's would not typically be allowed to occupy in parking spaces that are required for the existing use. Board Member Clarke expressed concern that if MMVs are allowed to park in regularly striped parking spaces, customers waiting to get food could obstruct the flow of traffic through the parking lot. He suggested that this concern could be addressed by requiring that food only be served through windows facing the sidewalk. Mr. Lien said that, typically, MMVs locate in the corner of parking lots where there is generally less traffic. However, he acknowledged that traffic safety is not specifically addressed in the code language.

Board Member Clarke asked if it would be possible to designate a specific space in a parking lot where MMVs are allowed to locate. Mr. Chave answered that during the license review process, the applicant would be required to specifically designate where the MMV would be located. Board Member Clarke voiced concern that this requirement would not ensure the location is the best and safest. Mr. Lien suggested that language could be added to the review criteria to ensure there is adequate parking for both the existing and mobile business. A provision could also be added to allow the City to review and evaluate the site plan to address traffic flow and safety.

Board Member Clarke noted that during events such as the Taste of Edmonds, Arts Festival, etc., food vendors pay a fee to locate within the venue area. He asked if the proposed code language would allow MMVs to locate within close proximity of an event venue. Not only would these vendors be able to avoid the participation fee, they could also disrupt the traffic flow and create safety issues. Mr. Lien agreed it would be reasonable to add some restrictions to address this issue.

Board Member Ellis asked if an MMV operator would be allowed to set up chairs and tables outside to serve customers. Mr. Lien said this is not addressed in the proposed language. However, the proposed language does require MMV operators to pack up all their belongings and leave the area at the end of the day.

Board Member Tibbott asked if the proposed language limits the number of parking stalls an MMV could occupy. Mr. Lien answered that it does not. Board Member Tibbott observed that it would be possible for a vendor to park sideways across two stalls and then set up an awning and other equipment that occupies several more stalls.

Board Member Clarke asked if it would be possible to approve the MMV provisions on a temporary basis, subject to a review after a one-year period. Mr. Lien said that some regulations are adopted with the provision that staff review the ordinance and report back to the City Council after one year. The Board could recommend this same approach for the MMV provisions.

Chair Lovell suggested that because the City Council has indicated their desire to allow MMV activities, the Board should discuss whether they should be allowed on private property, public property, or both. They need to provide some specific guidelines for each situation to address such issues as location, traffic flow, and parking requirements. They also need to discuss which zones should allow MMVs. He referred to Council Member Plunkett's response to the list of questions presented by staff on July 19, 2011 (see Attachment 2) and said he agrees that MMVs should not be allowed to stay overnight, and they should not be required to obtain design approval from the ADB or provide restroom facilities. However, he suggested the Board should have further discussion about whether or not MMVs should be allowed in all commercial zones.

Board Member Tibbott questioned if it would be appropriate to limit MMVs to only those parking spaces that are along streets and sidewalks as opposed to parking lots. If MMVs are allowed in parking lots, they can occupy multiple stalls and create traffic and pedestrian safety issues. Vice Chair Stewart cautioned against excluding parking lots altogether because the use could work well in some parking lot situations. If MMVs are only allowed to park along streets, they could take up valuable parking space that is used by the existing businesses. Mr. Lien reminded the Board that before obtaining a solicitor's license to locate in a privately-owned parking lot, an MMV operator would have to obtain permission from the property owner. A property owner would not likely grant this permission if it would negatively impact the business. On the other hand, no such approval would be required for an MMV operator to obtain a solicitor's license to park along a public right-of-way. If the Board decides it would be appropriate to limit the use to public rights-of-way, he suggested they should designate certain areas where the units could be located. This approach would also address distance requirements from existing restaurants. Board Member Tibbott expressed his belief that MMVs should not be allowed to park along streets in the BD1 zone.

Vice Chair Stewart suggested that if the City chooses to limit MMVs to designated streets, a map should be provided with the solicitor's license application to inform potential vendors of where they can locate. Mr. Lien said this approach would be a way to limit the number of MMVs allowed within the City's right-of-way, but it would not address MMVs on private property.

Board Member Clarke asked if MMVs would be allowed to use "human" signs to advertise their businesses. Mr. Lien answered that sign related issues are addressed by the sign code. Mr. Chave added that some jurisdictions have tried to single out this use, but they have run into freedom of speech issues. Mr. Lien said that MMVs typically only have one or two employees on site at any given time because the actual units are small.

Board Member Tibbott asked if the proposed language assumes the MMVs will be owner operated or would employees other than the owner be allowed to operate the unit. Mr. Lien said the majority of MMVs are owner operated, but some are successful enough that they have two or three units and hire employees. Board Member Tibbott asked if a background check is required for all employees or just the owner. Mr. Lien answered that ECC 4.12.040.B requires a background check for anyone who works inside an MMV.

Vice Chair Stewart asked about the City Council's reasons for wanting to promote MMVs. She expressed her belief that MMVs could offer an opportunity for additional revenue for the City. She asked what other cities charge for solicitor's licenses and street use permits. Mr. Lien pointed out that a street use permit would not be required for an MMV that is located on private property. Vice Chair Stewart asked if the City receives tax revenue from the items that are sold at MMVs located within the City.

Chair Lovell once again referred to the minutes from the July 19th City Council meeting, at which the City Council expressed general support for MMVs to increase the livelihood of the City. Tonight's discussion should focus on how to make the ECC and ECDC language consistent as it relates to MMVs. He suggested the Board should specifically focus their discussion on which zones MMVs should be allowed to locate in. Board Member Clarke suggested it would be helpful for staff to provide

examples of how other jurisdictions address MMVs. Mr. Lien said the City of Seattle recently updated their MMV provisions, but they are probably more complex than what the City Council is looking for. The City of Portland allow MMVs, but they are clustered in specific locations. He said he found examples from a few jurisdictions in Texas that were not too complex, but addressed some of the issues raised by the Board.

Board Member Johnson suggested that the first step is for the Board to decide exactly what they want the code language to achieve. If they want a lively street and sidewalk scene, the current proposed language is overly prohibitive because MMVs would only be allowed in a few limited locations. She suggested they answer the basic question of whether they want to promote MMVs for the liveliness of the street and the vivaciousness of the City or if they want to limit MMVs as much as possible and only allow the use where it would have minimal adverse impact. She observed that, as currently written, the language is contradictory. It talks about allowing MMVs, but then says they cannot park on the street. It requires that they be oriented towards the sidewalk, which will be difficult if they are not allowed to park in the street. Again, she said that until the Board identifies what it is they want to achieve, it will be difficult to address the details.

Board Member Johnson said it would be helpful to understand MMVs from a business standpoint. For example, would the City receive sales tax revenue from a catering business that is licensed in the City of Lynwood but operates in the City of Edmonds a few days a week? If there is no benefit to the City from an economic standpoint, perhaps the real benefit is providing ambiance and opportunities.

Chair Lovell agreed with Board Member Johnson. Rather than over structuring the MMV provisions, they should create some basic guidelines for where and how MMVs can operate in the City. Mr. Lien agreed to review the comments provided by the Board and update the draft ordinance. He also agreed to solicit feedback from the Engineering and Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Departments. When he presents the updated code language to the Board for continued discussion, he would provide maps to illustrate where MMVs could potentially locate. He said staff's goal is to have the MMV provisions adopted before summer.

Board Member Tibbott said another option is to identify specific areas in the City where MMVs can locate for a daily reservation rate. MMV operators could reserve the sites in advance and the City would receive revenue from the daily fee.

STAFF PRESENTATION OF 2012 EDMONDS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE (ECDC) UPDATE

Mr. Chave reported that staff presented an approach to updating the Edmonds Community Development Code (ECDC) at the recent City Council retreat. He said the intent is for a team of staff members to attempt a comprehensive rewrite of the ECDC this year, given that this is probably staff's last opportunity for the foreseeable future and it is a critical item to accomplish.

Mr. Chave emphasized the importance of distinguishing between the Edmonds City Code (ECC) and the Edmonds Community Development Code (ECDC). The ECC consists of Titles 1 through 10 and addresses issues such as health, safety, finance, officials, boards and commissions. The ECDC consists of Titles 15 through 23 and addresses issues such as building, planning and land use, public works, design and natural resources.

Mr. Chave said the current ECDC is a combination of legal documents and mystery. There is no entry point and no roadmap or guide. It is not easy to read and understand, and there are numerous inconsistencies and contradictions because it has been amended frequently. Staff is proposing a comprehensive structural change in the way the ECDC is written; the document will be reconfigured so it is easier for staff to administer and for the public to access and understand.

Mr. Chave said that the current ECDC is a written manual that is organized topic by topic, and the new version will be a hyperlinked roadmap that is integrated according to project and purpose. He explained that people using the code do not typically care which department administers a permit. They are most interested in learning about the requirements and process associated with a particular project. Using the current code, it is difficult to figure out which parts are applicable to any given project. There are few cross references so it is difficult for people to figure out where to start, and defined and undefined terms are dispersed throughout the document. For example sometimes the code talks about a dictionary definition for height, and other times it talks about a specific mechanism for calculating height. It is often difficult to determine which one applies. The new ECDC will clarify when and how the terms are used.

APPROVED

Mr. Chave said the current document is a written manual that was converted to an online format. It was never intended to be an online document. The new ECDC will be built for online access. He noted that people are now used to being able to search online for links and references. The new ECDC will require a different approach than the way the current code is constructed. It will contain more illustrations and diagrams, links to information, etc. However, it could still be printed as a written document. He said the current code implies segmented reviews and responsibilities. For example, the Building Department handles building permits, and the Planning Department handles the zoning code, etc. The current code does not consider conflicts between the various sections. The new version will be oriented towards shared interests and responsibilities. For example, combining all regulations related to land in one place will require departments to work together.

Mr. Chave said that through this process, staff will have an opportunity to review the code language with a focus on reorganizing the information in a more coherent manner. It is not staff's intent to change the regulations in a wholesale fashion, but they will review the code language with a fresh idea. The goal is to combine language and identify and eliminate the conflicts that frustrate both property owners and staff. It is anticipated that the update work will be done in house without hiring an outside consultant. Staff has knowledge of the existing code and how it works. Permit applications are increasing slowly, and large projects will need to be done in 2013 such as a building code update and updates to the Comprehensive Plan and Critical Areas Ordinance. These projects are anticipated to consume a significant amount of staff time in 2013. Staff believes that 2012 provides a window of opportunity to complete the Development Code update before permit applications increase and other projects come on line.

Mr. Chave said staff has researched a number of different collaboration tools, and they anticipate using mind mapping software to link sections in the existing code and rearrange them around central key words or ideas. This process will allow staff to visualize the existing code, as well the structural changes that are made. It will show where all of the existing code language was moved so that citizens are assured that nothing has been changed or lost.

Mr. Chave said staff made this same presentation to the City Council, and it was well received. While it will be a daunting task, staff believes that it is important to move forward with the project during the current window of opportunity. Tools are available to aid staff in the process and allow them to easily understand the critical structure, what they are trying to move, and how the various elements of the code are linked together. He summarized that the project will be an innovative effort, but well worth doing. He said staff believes there will be huge rewards for the City if they can complete the project as anticipated.

Chair Lovell asked if staff anticipates the need to hire an Information Technology (IT) professional at some point in the process. Mr. Chave said he does not anticipate it will be necessary to hire outside IT help, but the City may have to purchase some software.

Board Member Johnson announced that Sno Isle Library has an updated version of their traditional system, which incorporates the mind mapping concept. She suggested this is a good example of what the City is hoping to achieve.

Vice Chair Stewart commended staff for taking this project on; it is long overdue. She agreed with staff that the code must become more user friendly. Mr. Chave said that besides the more obvious benefits to users, it is anticipated that the demand on staff time will be reduced if people can access what they need on line and it is easy to understand and follow. He said this will help the City maintain their current staffing level in spite of mounting mandates from other sources. Board Member Tibbott asked how much savings staff anticipates on a yearly basis. Mr. Chave answered that he would not be surprised if the savings are as much as 15% to 20%. He expressed his belief that the current code works at cross purposes and staff spends a significant amount of time on code interpretation. He said that it takes between two and three years for a staff person to have enough experience to be proficient when working with an applicant.

PLANNING BOARD ORGANIZATION AND PROCEDURES

Chair Lovell advised that the Planning Board Guidelines have not been updated since 1995. He invited the Board to review the document and identify the needed changes. The Board agreed to revise the document as follows:

APPROVED

Section 3

- Delete Item D.
- Delete the second sentence in Item E and change the third sentence to read, “Draft minutes are subject to Board approval and shall be made available to the public.”

Section 4

- Delete Item A.3.
- In Item C.1 and C.2 delete “his or her.”
- In Item C.2 delete “him/her.”
- Delete the last sentence in Item C.2.
- Delete Items C.2.a, C.2.b, and C.2.c.
- Delete Item C.3

Section 10

- Change Item A to read, “The Chair has broad discretion over all matters regarding the conduct of meetings and shall exercise . . .”

Section 11

- Combine Items A and C.
- Add the following at the end of Item C: “as specified in the code or adopted by City Council policy.”
- In Item D change “or” to “for.”
- Change the first sentence in Item E to read, “All public comments must be made at the podium after the speaker firsts gives a name and city of residence so that comments . . .”
- In the last sentence of Item E, replace “anther” with “another meeting.”

Board Member Clarke asked if official minutes are taken at the Planning Board Retreat. Mr. Chave advised that no formal minutes are prepared for the retreat, but notes are taken. He noted that the Planning Board Guidelines do not specify how detailed the minutes have to be. Minutes of retreat discussions are general and focus on what the Board agreed upon rather than the deliberation that took place.

Mr. Chave pointed out that the current Planning Board Guidelines do not identify a term limit, and the issue is not addressed in the Edmonds City Code (ECC), either. At this time, Board Members are appointed to four-year terms, and formal reappointment by the City Council is required as per the ECC.

Board Member Stewart asked if the Planning Board Guidelines would need to be updated if the Board decides to bring on a student representative. Mr. Chave said the guidelines would need to be updated to make it clear that the student would not participate in quasi-judicial issues. However, he suggested the Board wait to update the guidelines until they move forward with a student representative idea.

Board Member Lovell asked if the Board’s current public hearing procedures are consistent with the ECC. Mr. Chave said he believes so, but he agreed to review the ECC to make sure.

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

Chair Lovell announced that a Planning Board retreat has been scheduled for February 22nd at 6:30 p.m. A list of agenda items was mailed to each Board Member. He invited them to provide feedback that will help the Chair and Vice Chair narrow the list to two or three items.

Vice Chair Stewart announced that David Hymel, Stewardship Partners, will provide a 30-minute presentation at the Board’s retreat starting at 6:30 p.m. Mr. Hymel is a rain garden consultant who works with governments and communities to create clusters of rain gardens throughout the Puget Sound area. Their goal is to have 12,000 rain gardens installed by 2016. He has ways of finding funding and moving communities to action.

APPROVED

Chair Lovell announced that the 3rd Strategic Plan and Visioning Retreat is scheduled for February 28th. The 4th retreat is scheduled for March 27th. Board Member Tibbott agreed to forward the PowerPoint presentation that was provided at the 2nd Strategic Plan and Visioning Retreat to each Board Member.

Chair Lovell advised that the March 14th agenda will include a discussion about the Bed and Breakfast code provisions and an update on the Shoreline Master Program.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

Chair Lovell announced that the next Citizens Economic Development Commission (CEDC) meeting is scheduled for February 15th, and the agenda includes a discussion about the BD zones and form-based zoning. He asked staff to share more information about what the CEDC will discuss regarding the two agenda items. Mr. Chave said the CEDC has asked to see the final results of the University of Washington students' work on form-based zoning before it is presented to the Planning Board for review. Mr. Chave reminded the Board that the City Council will continue their discussion about the Planning Board's recommendation regarding retail uses only in the BD1 zone. He said he is not sure what the CEDC's discussion regarding the BD zones will entail.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Board Member Johnson reported that the City Council extended the CEDC until April 25th. They postponed additional discussion about the future of the CEDC to a future meeting. She noted that approximately 1/3 of the original group has left the CEDC, and the City Council raised several questions about how new commissioners should be appointed, how long their terms should be, and whether the CEDC should continue to be an advisory group to the City Council.

Board Member Johnson said she would attend the February 15th CEDC meeting and would inform them of the Board's discussion about street vendors. They may have some interest in where the sales tax goes, which is not something the Board can address.

Board Member Ellis said the winter 2012 edition of the *NATIONAL PLANNING MAGAZINE* contains an article about the rise of form-based codes. It also provides some resource finders for form-based codes. He encouraged other Board Members to read these excellent articles.

Vice Chair Stewart reported that she and Board Member Tibbott attended the economic development stakeholders meeting last week. She recalled that the meetings had to be rescheduled because of the snow storm, and there was not good attendance. While she did not attend the stakeholder meeting related to parks, she learned that the discussion focused on Yost Pool and the need for an aquatics center in Edmonds.

Board Member Johnson reported on her attendance at the stakeholder meeting related to transportation, which was well attended by representatives from the Edmonds Bicycle Club, Washington State Department of Transportation—Ferries, Community Transit and the Edmonds Engineering and Public Works Departments. Don Fiene, the City's former assistant city engineer was also present.

ADJOURNMENT

The Board meeting was adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

APPROVED