

APPROVED JULY 25TH

**CITY OF EDMONDS
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

July 11, 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
Bill Ellis
John Reed
Neil Tibbott

STAFF PRESENT

Kernen Lien, Planner

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT

Kevin Clarke (excused)
Todd Cloutier (excused)

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER REED MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF JUNE 13, 2012 BE APPROVED AS AMENDED. BOARD MEMBER TIBBOTT SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

VICE CHAIR STEWART MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF JUNE 27, 2012 BE APPROVED AS AMENDED. BOARD MEMBER REED SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS

Dave Buelow, Edmonds, said he and his wife live in the 200 block of 4th Avenue South. He expressed a desire to share his concerns regarding the Port of Edmonds' proposed Harbor Square Master Plan. He said that despite a lot of materials being sent out by the Port, many people still do not know about the plan. Many that do know about the plan do not realize its ramifications for them. He said he must have thrown away the Port's first mailing, and he originally thought the second mailing was "real estate junk mail." He suggested that others may have done the same. He shared an example of a woman in a neighboring condominium building who was not aware of the plan for some time. She became upset when she realized that the Port's flag pole is a good indicator of 55-foot building heights and her view of the water would disappear, but she simply refuses to believe the City would ever allow this to happen. Mr. Buelow urged the Board to consider this silent group as they review the Port's Harbor Square Master Plan on June 25th. He explained that aside from not having adequate input to make an informed decision, the City Council may simply do what the Port Commission has already started to do; blame any recommendation or unpopular decision they make on the Planning Board if people start complaining when a specific project is ultimately proposed or when construction actually begins. He observed that the Port already started this political

backfilling process at their approval hearing. After unanimously passing the vision, a Port Commissioner actually apologized to those in attendance who voiced concerns about decimated views. He hoped these citizens were wrong in their impact assessment, but the Commission had relied on solely on a view shed study performed by others. This was despite repeated complaints that the study reflected view impacts from streets, sidewalks and plazas and not the numerous private homes on 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th Avenues South (the lower levels of the bowl). A development with 350 new condos in six 5-story buildings and one 4-story building, as well as 1,200 parking spaces, would be massive and have the potential to be the most negative thing that has happened in Edmonds during the 9 years he and his wife have been fortunate enough to live in the beautiful city.

Mr. Buelow said his first thoughts were regarding the elimination of the water view he and his wife paid for and cherish, but his next thoughts focused on all the property owners between SR-104 and 5th Avenue South who share their same plight. As an example, he noted that seven condominiums are currently for sale along 3rd Avenue South between Dayton and Howell Streets, five of which include pictures and verbiage about water views in their sales brochures. Each of these views would be eliminated if 55-foot buildings are allowed at Harbor Square. This quality of life and financial disaster will not just impact water view units in these buildings. Other units will also decrease in value when the upper floor's more expensive units decline in value. This of course will impact property tax revenues, largely off-setting new revenues the Port likes to talk about for Harbor Square.

Mr. Buelow said the future impact on those not immediately affected by 55-foot buildings should also be of concern. If the Port, a public tax-supported entity that already enjoys the highest height zoning in Edmonds of 35 feet, is allowed to build 55-foot buildings, the "me-too" factor will be huge and land squarely in the Board's laps. This obviously includes the old Safeway and adjoining properties to the north of Harbor Square, but could also include properties like The Reef Apartments, currently for sale next to the five-story Ebb Tide, which started the push for building height control many years ago. The City could also end up fielding a resurrected offer for a free senior center, with the caveat that four stories of condos on top are necessary to make it feasible for the developer. If 55-foot buildings are allowed at Harbor Square and elsewhere along the waterfront, then why should anyone else in the bowl feel they should be constrained by current zoning?

Mr. Buelow said another area of concern is the impact on foot and auto traffic. Harbor Square is already a congested area and would likely to get more so with projections of increased train traffic and construction of under and overpasses. He noted that if zoning is changed to allow residential construction at Harbor Square, the plan does not even include sufficient ingress and egress from SR-104 or Dayton Street for new homeowners. He reminded the Board that a lot of people walk in Edmonds, and crossing streets such as Dayton and 3rd Avenue South is already challenging. Adding significant traffic will impact all of Edmonds and likely necessitate changing roadway configurations and additional signalization in order to move vehicles and keep pedestrians safe. While the Port is also trying to sell their vision as transit-oriented, given the proposed 1,200 parking spots, the only real transit aspect happens to be the coincidence of location. A good example of potential impact is the comment made by the owner of Las Brisas when he recently congratulated her on her upcoming move to Old Milltown from Harbor Square. She said the reaction from regulars has been very favorable and almost all of them mentioned they would now be able to walk to the restaurant rather than drive. This proximity issue illustrates that while Harbor Square is only about 3 or 4 blocks from downtown, the reality is most inhabitants of new condos at Harbor Square would likely drive to shopping and dining. Thus, in addition to increased traffic, new condo owners would further task the already overburdened parking situation in town.

Mr. Buelow expressed frustration that the Port does not even need to redevelop Harbor Square from a financial perspective. He questioned why the Port paid \$13.5 million to buy out the developer's remaining lease and take over buildings they now say are not even worth maintaining. Although he felt the Port overpaid to settle legal issues, Harbor Square is still generating great cash flow; and the Port says it will have no problem retiring all Harbor Square debt when due in nine years, if not earlier. Asking the City for zoning help to triple the current property value and cost justify prior legal entanglements is simply mixing apples and oranges and is not fair to citizens. Property studies always come out justifying the purchaser's desired outcome. Again, he emphasized that the Port already enjoys the highest type of zoning in the bowl at 35 feet. Any redevelopment at Harbor Square, residential or otherwise, should be done within the existing height limitations.

Ken Reidy, Edmonds, thanked the Planning Board for their attention to development code amendments. He particularly appreciated their efforts related to the street vacation amendments. He suggested that as other code amendments are presented to the Board for review in the future, it may be beneficial to include actual references to the Revised Code of

Washington (RCW). Mr. Reidy announced that he requested the City Council provide an update on the status of the comprehensive rewrite of the Edmonds Community Development Code (ECDC), which was scheduled to occur in 2012. He said the current ECDC has had known problems for many years, and a rewrite was budgeted to occur 2006 and 2007. In 2007, the City Attorney reported to the City Council that the highest priority was the code rewrite, yet the majority of it was never completed. He said that, as a citizen, he is confused about who is responsible for making sure this work is finished. He said he hopes to have more details about the current status of the project soon.

Don C, Edmonds, asked if the Port of Edmonds would be required to complete an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as part of their Harbor Square Master Plan proposal. He expressed his belief that an EIS should definitely be required on a project of this proposed size and impact.

PRESENTATION ON EDMONDS MARSH BY KEELEY O'CONNELL

Chair Lovell recalled that the Board requested a presentation by Keeley O'Connell regarding the Edmonds Marsh. He said the Board is particularly interested in adjacency and influence issues related to the potential Harbor Square Master Plan. The Board is seeking as much information as possible in preparation for future discussions. He said the Board's responsibility is to evaluate the proposed Harbor Square Master Plan in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan. As part of this process, the Board believes it is important to learn about the marsh and its impact and influence on the area.

Board Member Reed reminded the Board that they have been reviewing the Shoreline Master Program (SMP) for more than a year, and the deadline for completion was extended. He noted that there is a strong relationship between the proposed new Urban Mixed Use III Environment, which is adjacent to the Edmonds Marsh and the Harbor Square Property, and the proposed Harbor Square Master Plan. He referred to a comment letter from Ms. O'Connell that provided information related to buffers, heights, and setbacks, and noted that the proposed SMP includes a series of stated values for each one. He said he would like more specific input from Ms. O'Connell regarding whether or not the proposed buffers and setback requirements are sufficient.

Keeley O'Connell, Friends of the Edmonds Marsh, said she is a restoration ecologist for People for Puget Sound and does not have expertise regarding appropriate buffer and setback requirements. However, she agreed to invite a representative from Friends of the Edmonds Marsh to provide additional information to the Board. She explained that, as currently developed, the existing buffer on the Harbor Square site is very small. There is not a lot of opportunity for enhancement at this time, and there is no existing stormwater filtration on site. Currently, all runoff goes directly to the marsh with no filtration, and applying restoration techniques to the current site would do little to improve the situation. Friends of Edmonds Marsh sees potential redevelopment at Harbor Square as an opportunity to make some positive changes to the marsh, with guidance from people who specialize in this type of work, to maximize the benefits to the habitat and marsh that are not currently available.

Ms. Keeley said restoration of the Edmonds Marsh is becoming a regionally-recognized project of significance. She explained that about 98% of these habitats were completely filled and developed in the Central Puget Sound Basin. They are completely lost and are not available for restoration. No other community in the Central Puget Sound Basin has this type of opportunity. She announced that People for Puget Sound successfully applied for State Salmon Recovery Fund dollars, and they were awarded a grant of \$100,000 to start studying the feasibility of restoring the Edmonds Marsh. This restoration includes daylighting the creek channel and potentially eliminating the need for the tide gate. This more natural flushing would allow salmon back into the system. She advised that while the restoration plan represents a suite of projects, the current funding source is extremely focused on recovering juvenile Chinook Salmon, which are listed on the Endangered Species List. She noted that, historically, the system supported spawning Coho Salmon and there is no reason to think that it couldn't do so again in the future. Because of the urban environment, stormwater is a significant factor.

Ms. O'Connell provided an historic overlay of what the marsh looked like in 1853. The steep hillside was heavily forested and the marsh extended all the way to Brackett's landing. A barrier estuary was created when a sand spit was formed by prevailing currents from the south to the north. Prior to the railroad, an abundance of material sloughed off the bluffs to the south of the marsh and traveled north of the beach to create the sand spit. The railroad impacted the historical sediment source by creating a barricade between the material that naturally fell onto the beach. She said that 24 acres of the historically 60-acre marsh remains today as a barrier estuary. Two, year-round spring creeks flow into the marsh, resulting in

a mixture of fresh and saltwater. She summarized that the marsh is an extremely important habitat for juvenile salmon. They are small when they come out of the rivers, and they need a lot of food before they can enter the ocean and have a chance of survival. They are looking for nursery habitats like the Edmonds Marsh, where they can stay for six months to a year before moving to the ocean to mature. Again, she emphasized that 98% of this habitat has been lost in the Central Puget Sound Basin, and the Edmonds Marsh is one of the few remaining opportunities for improvement.

Ms. O'Connell also provided an illustration of the Edmonds Marsh as it existed in 1947. There was no development along SR-104, and the tidal channel extended all the way to Dayton. Salmon were present. There was some human influence, and the railroad and oil facility had been developed by that time. By 1967, the property between Dayton and Main Street was developed, and another portion of the marsh was lost. Additional marsh area was filled to accommodate the Harbor Square development in 1985. The remaining 24-acres of marsh is made up of a main section that is owned by the City and a smaller section under private ownership that was cut off by SR-104 but still has some potential for tidal influence.

Ms. O'Connell provided a map to identify the marsh and its tributaries and outlets. She explained that properties surrounding Willow Creek are fully developed as residential, with a lot of intact habitat that will accommodate potential salmon spawning. Shellebarger Creek is much more organized and flows through the bowl area. Much of the creek has been piped to accommodate infrastructure and development. It cuts through private properties, and People for Puget Sound received funding from NOAA to complete a streamside property owner workshop series this past spring. They learned that most people who have creeks flowing through their yards try to make them part of the landscaping. They often make changes they believe are helpful without realizing the impact to downstream properties. Both creeks provide a year round system of water and stormwater coming directly to the marsh.

Ms. O'Connell said that the two creeks merge in the southwest corner of the marsh and go through a series of somewhat natural channels until they reach a manmade ditch that helps direct the water out. She pointed out the portion of the ditch that follows the railroad track, which is wide and shallow without a lot of vegetation. The water flows into a pipe under the railroad tracks, where it takes a 90 degree turn at the east corner of Marina Beach Park. It flows underneath Marina Beach Park and empties out at such a low tidal elevation that juvenile fish cannot currently navigate it. However, adult fish were still able to navigate into the marsh until the pipe was extended deeper about seven years ago because it kept getting plugged with sediment. She said there are currently resident no Cutthroat Trout in Willow Creek, and they believe there are some in Shellebarger Creek up to 3rd Avenue where there is a fish passage barrier.

Ms. O'Connell summarized that the current system provides a very intact habitat to support salmon, but they no longer have the salmon that previously existed. People for Puget Sound has undertaken a study on the feasibility of daylighting Willow Creek by extending the ditch along the east side of the railroad tracks to the two new culverts that Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) installed to accommodate the new line of tracking. However, she emphasized that no specific alignment has been identified. Because the project is focused on salmon, there are opportunities for grant funding for the project all the way through construction. However, before the project can move forward to the design phase, it is important to provide information to indicate that Chinook Salmon are present and that they would be able to successfully navigate in and out of the system without getting trapped. They must also identify how much of the area would convert to salt marsh as a result of daylighting Willow Creek. This study will also identify how many salmon can be supported by doing the restoration action. In addition, the City of Edmonds is conducting a study of the Dayton Street/SR-104 area to determine why water coming down Shellebarger Creek gets backed up and floods the intersection. This study will provide a significant amount of hydrology information about Shellebarger Creek that can be used to create a hydrologic model of the marsh. Ms. O'Connell referred to a study conducted by a student to determine the impact of converting the Chevron property into marsh and public access. She also referred to a view shed study that was conducted by graduate students from the University of Washington.

Ms. O'Connell said that benefits of marsh restoration include improving salmon and wildlife habitat, providing more passive recreation opportunities, and providing more opportunities for education and science. Addressing stormwater and flooding issues would be a major benefit for the City. Many pollutants flow from the streets, through the storm drains and directly into the marsh without being treated. Water quality is a huge human health issue, and improving the marsh would help to address this concern. This type of habitat is an amazing sponge. If designed well, it can offer a way to manage potentially increasing flood waters in the region from climate change. Research has shown that marshes are just as effective at storing carbon as tropical rainforests. Saltwater marshes, in particular, also store methane, which is another greenhouse gas that freshwater marshes and tropical rainforests do not store. Saltwater marshes will be very important when talking about carbon

markets and how they play into the economy in the region. She provided pictures to illustrate potential passive recreation opportunities. She said job creation and economic recovery is important, and restoring the natural capital in the region is extremely important in this aspect.

Ms. O'Connell reviewed that People for Puget Sound currently has funding to gather all existing data, conduct baseline surveys, map the marsh, and install instruments to measure tidal water level, temperature and salinity. Although not likely feasible, they will also consider alternatives other than daylighting Willow Creek as required by the State for due diligence. Once the data has been collected, it will be put into a model to show how things will change when a new channel is opened. A biologist will consider the restored habitat conditions and anticipate potential benefit to fish. This will enable them to determine a cost/benefit analysis and, if feasible, request additional funding to move the project forward into the design phase. She said she anticipates the study will be completed within 12 to 18 months.

Ms. O'Connell advised that, as the study moves forward, Friends of the Edmonds Marsh will look for ways to educate the community and get them involved in the conversation. They will continue to provide public presentations and meet with additional stakeholders such as BNSF, Chevron, and the Washington State Department of Transportation Ferries Division.

Board Member Ellis asked if daylighting Willow Creek and restoring the marsh would increase the tidally-influenced area and extend the boundaries of the shoreline jurisdiction. Ms. O'Connell answered that the tidally-influenced area would be increased. However, because the influence of the tide is already as far north as it can go (to the levy), the starting point at which the Department of Ecology (DOE) would determine the Shoreline Master Program (SMP) jurisdiction would not change. Mr. Lien added that the shoreline jurisdiction could extend further eastward towards SR-104, depending on the salinity of the water.

Vice Chair Stewart asked if the 24-acre marsh area is divided between wetland and salt marsh. Ms. O'Connell said the 24-acres represents several different habitat types, but they do not know the actual acreage of each one. This delineation will be done as part of the study. She said her best estimate is that 4 to 6 acres is actual salt marsh at this time. This number would definitely increase by getting more tidal waters into the system, and the study will identify how much. The remaining portion of the marsh is a freshwater wetland, the majority of which is cattail marsh. This non-native cattail still serves a habitat function, and some will remain no matter what is done. However, introducing more saltwater will give way to more productive saltwater habitat that supports a much wider diversity of wildlife, in particular the salmon. A small portion of the 24-acres (on the east side) is scrub shrub, which is a transition area from the cattail marsh into the forest. Vice Chair Stewart observed that while the 24-acre marsh would not expand, the composition of the habitat will change based on salinity.

Vice Chair Stewart referred to an article that Ms. O'Connell provided to the Board, which indicated that the value of ecosystem services from wetlands and saltwater marshes could be as much as \$2 million for the City if it is used wisely. This is an additional opportunity for natural capital. Ms. O'Connell said this information was put together by Earth Economics, who specifically studied the Puget Sound Basin and placed a dollar value on ecosystem services that nature provides free of charge. The largest ones are filtering drinking water and improving air quality. It is important to understand that the loss of natural places and healthy, intact habitat does not just impact wildlife; it also impacts human health. They should utilize the human health aspect as a mechanism for moving projects forward. Investing in natural resources and natural capital saves money from having to build infrastructure to provide these same functions.

Board Member Tibbott asked what contingencies have been considered related to a multi-modal transportation system at the south end of the marsh. He asked if this would result in potential daylighting opportunities on the north end after the ferry terminal is moved. Ms. O'Connell said conversations about daylighting Willow Creek first started as part of a plan to relocate the ferry terminal. Purely from a habitat and wildlife standpoint it would be better if there were no ferry terminal, but it would open an opportunity for conversation and research about converting at least a portion of the Chevron property back to marsh. This is the only opportunity for increasing the size of the marsh, but it may not be feasible given the contamination on site. She said conversations with the Washington State Department of Transportation have been limited, and relocation of the ferry terminal is no longer part of their long-range plan. Although they still have option on the property, it is not available for purchase until it reaches the DOE's clean up requirements. There is no projection for when the clean up requirements will be met. She said the DOE's original concept and design is outdated, and the region thinks about transportation differently now. The plan will need to be updated and conversations will be reopened. It is possible a minimal build would occur that would still allow opportunities for restoration to take place simultaneously.

Chair Lovell thanked Ms. O'Connell for her presentation. He noted that the Board will not be discussing the Harbor Square Master Plan at this meeting. He referred to a letter submitted by Friends of the Edmonds Marsh, which covers many of the items discussed by Ms. O'Connell. He said it would be helpful for a representative from Friends of the Edmonds Marsh to provide input to the Board as they study the Harbor Square Master Plan proposal. They would particularly appreciate input on buffer and setback requirements, public access, stormwater management, and flooding. He advised that the Harbor Square Master Plan is scheduled to come before the Board for review on July 25th, and he anticipates their review will continue well into the 4th quarter of the year. At least one public hearing will be conducted before the Board forwards a recommendation to the City Council. Ms. O'Connell reported that she does not anticipate that the consultant would finish the study until at least the first of December.

Ms. O'Connell agreed to update the PowerPoint presentation and provide a copy of it to the City so it can be made available to the public. She said Friends of the Edmonds Marsh has a Facebook page, but they do not have a website.

PROPOSED CODE AMENDMENT TO EDMONDS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE (ECDC) 20.70.030 CITY EASEMENT RIGHTS FOR PUBLIC UTILITIES AND SERVICES AND ECDC 20.70.140.A.3 FINAL DECISION IN STREET VACATIONS (FILE NUMBER AMD20120005)

Mr. Lien reviewed that at the Planning Board's public hearing on providing expanding notice requirements for street vacations, Mr. Reidy identified two additional items in ECDC 20.70 that could also be updated. Mr. Reidy suggested inserting language from the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 35.79.030 within two sections of ECDC 20.70 as follows:

- **Amendment 1** – Insert “construction repairs and maintenance of” prior to “public utility services” in ECDC 20.70.030. This would clarify the type of easement the City may retain in street vacations.
- **Amendment 2** – Change “applicant” to “owners of property abutting upon the street or alley or part thereof so vacated” in ECDC 20.70.140.A.3. The language in this section does not make sense if the City initiates the street vacation.

Mr. Lien recalled that at a previous meeting, the Planning Board discussed the potential need for legal counsel on this issue. He suggested the Board identify their specific questions and invite the City Attorney to respond in writing.

Chair Lovell referred to an excerpt from the City Council's June 5, 2012 meeting minutes (Attachment 2), which talked specifically about the two additional amendments to bring the code into conformance with RCW 35.79.030 as recommended by Mr. Reidy. He summarized that the City Council moved to direct the City Attorney to draft an ordinance approving the previously proposed code amendments as recommended by the Board. He asked if the ordinance has been drafted and approved. Mr. Lien clarified that the City Attorney drafted an ordinance related solely to the notice requirement. The City Council remanded two additional amendments to the Planning Board for consideration. Chair Lovell asked if the City Attorney has reviewed the draft amendments (Attachment 3). Mr. Lien said the City Attorney is aware of the proposed amendments, but he has not been invited to provide specific input. He said the proposed amendments are consistent with RCW 35.79.030.

Mr. Lien referred to the proposed amendment to ECDC 20.70.140.A.3 and explained that sometimes the City initiates a street vacation. If the City is the applicant, the language related to monetary compensation would not be applicable. The proposed change would simply clarify the language. Board Member Ellis pointed out that the word “meets” should be changed to “meet” to be consistent with the proposed new language. He also noted that if the word “applicant” is replaced in Item A.3, it should also be replaced in the last sentence of ECDC 20.70.140.A.3.b and in ECDC 20.70.140.C. Board Member Cloutier pointed out that the word “applicant” is also used in ECDC 20.70.060. Mr. Lien agreed to review each section where the word “applicant” is used and adjust the language accordingly.

Board Member Tibbott asked if it is possible for a non-owner to make application for a street vacation. Board Member Cloutier pointed out that, as per the current code language (ECDC 20.70.050), a street vacation can only be initiated by the City Council or the owners of more than 2/3 of the property abutting the portion of the street to be vacated.

APPROVED

The Board directed staff to solicit input from the City Attorney regarding the proposed changes. They agreed to move forward with a public hearing on September 12th, as long as the scope of the changes is similar to those discussed by the Board. If the changes are more extensive, the Board expressed a desire to review the document again before the public hearing. Mr. Lien noted that the City Attorney would prepare a draft ordinance for the Board's review and a public hearing.

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

Chair Lovell briefly reviewed the extended agenda, noting that the July 25th agenda will include a presentation on the Port's Harbor Square Master Plan and an update on the Shoreline Master Program. A Strategic Plan Retreat has been scheduled for July 31st, and the Board's August 8th meeting agenda will include a presentation by the City Attorney on ethics and the Public Meetings Act and further discussion of form-based zoning for the Westgate and Five Corners areas. The Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director is scheduled to present a quarterly report on August 22nd, and a public hearing on the street vacation amendments is scheduled for September 12th.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

Chair Lovell announced that the Port's Harbor Square Master Plan proposal has been posted on the City's website, including all the attachments, reports, minutes of public meetings, etc. Before they begin their review of the Harbor Square Master Plan, he strongly recommended that each Board Member thoroughly read the City's current Comprehensive Plan, specifically Pages 42 through 60 that relate to the downtown/waterfront area. Their review of the Port's Harbor Square Master Plan should be based on its consistency with the current Comprehensive Plan.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Board Member Cloutier suggested that before they begin their review of the Harbor Square Master Plan, it would be helpful for the Board and staff to have a discussion about the process and identify exactly what the Board is supposed to consider as they review the proposal. This will help them focus their discussion on issues that are within the Board's purview to address rather than getting sidetracked. The conversation will also help the Board understand all of the issues that must be addressed as part of their review. Chair Lovell said he anticipates a significant amount of public involvement throughout the process. Board Member Cloutier agreed and said it is important to have a clear understanding of what the City can mandate, versus recommend, versus encourage, etc.

Board Member Reed said the Port's website provides a link to everything that has happened since the Harbor Square Master Plan process started. He encouraged Board Members to review this background material to understand the discussions that took place to get the Port to where they are now.

Vice Chair Stewart said she is scheduled to provide a Planning Board report to the City Council on August 7th. She noted that it will be important to specifically report on the Board's July 25th discussion regarding the Port's Harbor Square Master Plan.

Board Member Tibbott requested a status report on the City's effort to revise the Edmonds Community Development Code so that it is available on the City's website with hyperlinks rather than in linear format. Mr. Lien reported that this project was postponed for a time due to a staff member's family emergency. The project will resume soon. Board Member Tibbott asked if staff is seeking outside consultation on how to put the hyperlink pieces together. Chair Lovell recalled that Mr. Chave previously indicated the work would be done in house.

The Board discussed the short press releases that have been prepared and submitted to *THE BEACON* and *myedmondsnews.com* by Board Member Tibbott to report on the Board's activities. The Board agreed that the articles should not voice an opinion, but should provide factual information about the Board's discussions. Board Member Reed suggested that a more effective tool would be to publish a short article announcing the Board's upcoming agenda topics in *myedmondsnews.com* on the Monday before each meeting. He suggested it would be particularly helpful to announce that the July 25th agenda would include a presentation by Friends of the Edmonds Marsh and an introduction of the Port's Harbor Square Master Plan. The remainder of the Board concurred.

APPROVED

ADJOURNMENT

The Board meeting was adjourned at 8:34 p.m.

APPROVED