

**APPROVED AUGUST 27<sup>TH</sup>**

**CITY OF EDMONDS  
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

**August 13, 2014**

---

---

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

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT**

Neil Tibbott, Vice Chair  
Bill Ellis  
Philip Lovell  
Daniel Robles  
Careen Rubenkönig  
Valerie Stewart

**STAFF PRESENT**

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager  
Jerry Shuster, Stormwater Engineering Program Manager  
Shane Holt, Development Services Director  
Karin Noyes, Recorder

**BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT**

Todd Cloutier, Chair (excused)  
Ian Duncan (excused)

**READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**BOARD MEMBER ELLIS MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF JULY 23, 2014 BE APPROVED AS AMENDED. BOARD MEMBER RUBENKONIG SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY, WITH VICE CHAIR TIBBOTT AND BOARD MEMBER STEWART ABSTAINING.**

**ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA**

The agenda was accepted as presented.

**AUDIENCE COMMENTS**

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

**DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIRECTOR'S REPORT TO PLANNING BOARD**

Ms. Hope referred the Board to the written report that covers information on the status of plans, code updates, and community boards and events.

Board Member Lovell referred to the supplemental document the Board received, which lists the key objectives for the Development Code re-write. He recalled that at the Board's previous discussion with staff, it was recommended that they focus on appropriate revisions to the code first and then consider changes to the processes. Ms. Hope explained that the intent is to use an integrated approach to change and/or adjust a number of items in the Development Code. Changes to the process would be considered as part of the overall update and not as a separate item after the update has been completed. Board Member Lovell expressed concern that people may try to focus more on the administrative processes and

governmental functions as a way to address their perceived shortfalls with the code. Ms. Hope clarified that the list of “key objectives” provided in the supplement was intended to reflect the Board’s retreat discussion and provide a broad overview of the underlying direction of the Development Code update. More details will follow. She reminded the Board that there is money in the City’s budget to hire a consultant to do a great deal of the work, but there will be numerous opportunities for public input and the Planning Board will have extensive involvement in the process, as well.

Board Member Stewart thanked Ms. Hope for her very interesting and informative Director’s Report, which helps the Board Members think about things they may not have considered before. It also informs the Board of what other cities in the area are up to, as well as the nationwide trend.

**DISCUSSION ON THE CITY OF EDMONDS STORMWATER CODE UPDATE PROCESS**

Ms. Hope advised that the presentation would summarize the materials provided in the Staff Report regarding the Stormwater Code update. She explained that information is changing even as the City tries to get a handle on the requirements.

Mr. Shuster provided a picture of a bio-retention facility, also known as a rain garden, which is located on the Key Bank property on SR104 and 100<sup>th</sup> Avenue. He explained that stormwater from the parking lot goes into the facility where it is treated and infiltrated into the ground. He advised that the City encourages this type of stormwater facility so that stormwater can be treated on site rather than being discharged into Puget Sound and/or other waterways.

Mr. Shuster explained that the City has a mandate to meet the requirements of the Western Washington Phase II Municipal Stormwater Permit, which is issued by the Department of Ecology (DOE) to approximately 84 municipalities in the Puget Sound Region. The permit allows the City to discharge stormwater into Puget Sound, Shell Creek, and Lake Ballinger, as long as certain things are done to make the stormwater as clean as possible. This water-quality permit is intended to protect fish and other aquatic habitat, and is not intended to protect houses from flooding. Other City regulations address flooding issues.

Mr. Shuster explained that the new permit mandates a new approach to development. Currently, developers design a site using the Development Code and then manage the stormwater generated by the project through the stormwater code. The new approach requires the Development Code to include site design goals that minimize the amount of stormwater that is generated by reducing the amount of impervious surface and retaining native vegetation. In addition, the stormwater that is generated by default must be controlled using Low-Impact Development (LID) Techniques. Conventional stormwater control techniques would only be allowed if a developer can demonstrate that LID would not be feasible. He provided a diagram to illustrate how the new development paradigm could be implemented using drought tolerant, native plants; minimizing lawn area; pervious walkways, driveways and deck; low-impact foundation technology and rain garden infiltration.

Ms. Hope emphasized the need to look at the development code as a whole. In addition to stormwater, they must also think about how to accommodate and provide a healthy transportation system, pedestrian opportunities, housing, and places for business. The City is part of a growing region and must find ways to have healthy development and retain existing places. It is a balancing act, in which stormwater is an important component. She suggested that, as the City updates its Development Code, there will be opportunities to address stormwater issues in a new way, particularly by encouraging a variety of LID techniques. Other potential code amendments to evaluate include reduced road width, changes in road layout and orientation, clustering, higher buildings and smaller footprints, parking regulations, and landscaping using bio-retention. She summarized that this will be a lengthy process that will start with identifying and understanding the LID topics that need to be addressed and then reviewing existing codes and standards and filling in the gaps.

Mr. Shuster advised that, in addition to updating the Edmonds Stormwater Code to incorporate and require LID principles and best management practices to make LID the preferred and commonly used approach to site development by December 31, 2016, the City must update its Stormwater Code (ECDC 18.30), with a goal of dispersing, infiltrating and retaining stormwater on site to the extent feasible. The more stormwater is managed on site, the less impact there will be on waterways. He reviewed that the Stormwater Code was last updated in 2010 as required by the initial permit that was issued in 2006. The 2010 update is a 72-page guide to stormwater management in Edmonds for small and large sites. It outlines the minimal technical requirements and references portions of the 2005 Ecology Stormwater Management Manual, which

addresses site planning and selecting and maintaining treatment systems. It also outlines Edmonds Specific Flow Control Requirements. In addition to the Edmonds Specific Flow Control Requirements, the 2016 Stormwater Code revisions will reference the 2012 Ecology Stormwater Management Manual, the Low-Impact Development Technical Guidance Manual for Puget Sound and the Rain Garden Handbook for Western Washington.

Mr. Shuster advised that the Phase II Permit was appealed by several jurisdictions. The Pollutions Control Hearings Board heard the appeal and directed the DOE to make changes. On August 6<sup>th</sup>, the DOE came out with a new draft permit and stormwater manual, which is now out for public comment through October 6<sup>th</sup>. The DOE will then review the comments and make appropriate changes, and the revised permit and manual should be out by the end of year and effective early next year. In particular, the new draft permit makes it clear that the Low Impact Development Technical Guidance Manual for Puget Sound is not intended to be used for regulatory purposes and the Rain Garden Handbook for Western Washington is intended for guidance only. Cities are still trying to figure out what the changes mean.

Mr. Shuster advised that implementation of the new permit requirements will require:

- Staff Training. Many of the requirements are new, and staff members will need to participate in the training opportunities offered by the DOE. At this time, they are very busy reviewing development permits under the current code and will wait to participate in training until the DOE figures out exactly what the new requirements will be.
- Developer, Homeowner and Contractor Training. The City will need to provide information and training to developers, homeowners and contractors regarding the new permit requirements.
- Administrative Revisions. The application forms, review checklists and permit tracking program will need to be modified.
- Maintenance of LID Facilities. LID stormwater facilities can be very different from conventional facilities, and there will be a learning curve. Addressing this issue appropriately may require the expertise of a landscaper or another professional.

Mr. Shuster reported that the City has started the process of updating the LID stormwater management standards to match the most current standards. They have also started to update the Edmonds Stormwater Code Supplement to require LID stormwater techniques as the default approach for all size of sites, which should be finished by the end of 2015.

Ms. Hope advised that, as part of the process of updating the Development Code, staff has requested funding from the Stormwater Utility Fund in 2015 to help them through the process. In addition, they anticipate grant funding from the DOE will be available after the 2015 Legislative session.

Board Member Lovell asked if existing homeowners would be required to comply with the new stormwater requirements. Mr. Shuster answered that the new requirements would only apply to new construction and major revisions. If a property is developed or modified significantly, the owner would be required to comply and utilize LID techniques to the extent possible.

Board Member Rubenkonig asked how the City would determine the threshold for when compliance would be required. Mr. Shuster said the current threshold is set at 2,000 square feet or more of new and/or replaced impervious surface. For example, replacing a garage on the existing foundation would not be considered replaced impervious surface, but removing the foundation and expanding the house out to where the garage was located would be. He noted that the City's threshold has been in place since 2008, and the DOE's threshold is actually 5,000 square feet.

Board Member Stewart commended staff for their work and said she understands the need for time to address all of the issues in a holistic way. However, she is concerned that development permits continue to be processed based on the less restrictive requirements. It is likely that developers with projects that have remained dormant for a number of years will try to push them through before the new standards are adopted. She questioned if it would be possible to mandate a three-year expiration period in light of the higher standards. Another option would be to provide incentives for developers to go forward under the new 2012 manual. Mr. Shuster agreed that vesting to the less restrictive requirements will be a problem.

Ms. Hope explained that the City has the ability to control some situations; but others, such as how long a subdivision application can remain active, are mandated by state law. She said the City is trying to encourage people to do the right thing by providing more information about low-impact approaches to stormwater control. She reminded the Board that they recently forwarded proposed amendments to the City Council that would require developers at Westgate to use LID techniques. Board Member Stewart said it is important for the City to point out the advantages of doing LID and encourage developers to be an example for others to follow. She said she understands that staff is working hard to help property owners and developers make forward-thinking decisions even before they are mandated. She feels good that the City is actually doing a lot of thinking earlier than expected so they will be ready to implement more LID requirements by late 2015.

Board Member Stewart requested more information about why the DOE has determined that compliance with the Low-Impact Development Technical Guidance Manual for Puget Sound and the Rain Garden Handbook for Western Washington cannot be required for certain types of new projects. Mr. Shuster explained that there is a regulatory distinction between a bio-retention facility and a rain garden. While they are essentially the same thing, rain gardens are smaller and serve just one lot. He said the City provides copies of the 2013 Rain Garden Handbook to interested property owners, and they are working to create a handout for rain gardens and permeable pavement infiltration. They are also working to update the handout related to LID techniques to incorporate the new standards. While they cannot require people to meet the new standards yet, they can encourage them to do so by pointing out the benefits.

Board Member Stewart stressed the importance of making sure that rain gardens are installed by trained professionals. There should also be performance measures in place to ensure that rain gardens are properly maintained or serious problems can occur. She noted that there are examples of low-performing rain gardens throughout the City. Mr. Shuster agreed that the concept is new, and it is important to find the right contractor. Staff is not currently trained to inspect rain gardens, and he can make a plea to the City Council for additional funding for staff to perform this work.

Board Member Stewart reported that she participates on the Sno-King Watershed Council, which recently put together a letter to the DOE commenting on the 2012 Stormwater Management Manual. The council suggested that cities collaborate with nearby cities to address stormwater issues on a regional basis. Watersheds do not have jurisdictional boundaries. Mr. Shuster said it would be great if the DOE provided a model code, but they did not.

Board Member Stewart reported that King County has started its review of the 2012 Stormwater Manual, and she has forwarded comments to Mr. Shuster. Mr. Shuster explained that the Phase II Permit allows the City to either adopt the 2012 (soon to be 2014) Stormwater Management Manual or another manual written by a selected Phase I jurisdiction (such as King or Snohomish County and/or the City of Seattle) that the DOE approves by June 20, 2015. He advised that the City of Seattle has a very good manual for an urban environment that could be used to address the urban parts of Edmonds. He noted that the 2012 manual was mostly written for growing communities with subdivisions.

Vice Chair Tibbott said he assumes that the 2012 Stormwater Management Manual, Low-Impact Development Technical Guidance Manual for Puget Sound and the Rain Garden Handbook for Western Washington represent Best Available Science (BAS). He said his understanding is that the City will be reviewing some aspect of BAS within the next few years. Ms. Hope clarified that this work relates to the Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO), which must also reflect BAS. The CAO must be updated by the end of 2015, as mandated by the Growth Management Act. Vice Chair Tibbott pointed out, and Ms. Hope agreed, that the updates to the stormwater code could dovetail with CAO update.

Ms. Hope cautioned that there is no one-size-fits-all standard for addressing stormwater issues, and stormwater requirements must be different depending on the environment. For example, an urban environment with compact development is much different than a large undeveloped area or an area with wetlands and/or steep slopes.

Vice Chair Tibbott requested information regarding maintenance needs for rain gardens and bio-retention facilities. Mr. Shuster said it is important to start with a certain pallet of plants, and he expects they would need to be trimmed on a regular basis. In addition, rain gardens require a certain mix of soil and mulch in order to function properly. Board Member Rubenkönig noted that pervious surface, such as pervious concrete, requires regular maintenance, as well. Mr. Shuster agreed that all LID techniques have their own special maintenance requirements.

Vice Chair Tibbott asked if there is any way for the City determine the amount of stormwater that is being handled by any particular system. Mr. Shuster explained that the engineer who designs a bioswales can determine the appropriate size for the facility by creating a computer model that measures the rain flow coming from the site. The DOE has its own software that it requires engineers to use and it is available free of charge.

Board Member Stewart said she has personal experience with a rain garden that functions well. However, homeowners must take responsibility for regular maintenance so that plants continue to filter the toxins and the water can be absorbed. It is also critical to clean the drain pipe going into the rain garden, which often gets clogged with leaves. She said she also collects over 800 gallons of rainwater, which she uses for irrigation. Excess rainwater goes to into the rain garden. She said her system has functioned well during times of heavy rain.

Mr. Shuster reminded the Board that if a rain garden is used by a developer as opposed to an underground system, a covenant would be required to ensure that the rain garden is not removed. This requirement would be applicable to any subsequent owner, as well. Board Member Rubenkönig said it is important to be clear that the City is not proposing to regulate someone's private rain garden. A property owner can install their own rain garden without meeting any specific City requirements, and the City would not require them to disconnect from the City's stormwater system. No covenant would be required, either. The new stormwater requirements would apply primarily to new construction and significant changes.

Board Member Rubenkönig asked if developers who choose the rain garden approach would be required to obtain the services of a professional to ensure that the facility is designed and installed properly. Mr. Shuster said there would be no specific requirements for existing homeowners who want to install a rain garden, but the City would refer the property owner to the Rain Garden Handbook for Western Washington as a guide. There are two options the City could consider for development or redevelopment that triggers the stormwater code threshold:

1. Adopt pre-size tables that have been vetted by an engineer. The size of the rain garden would depend on the projects total square footage. This approach would be easy for staff to implement.
2. Require developers to hire an engineer to design the facility. This could involve a more rigorous assessment of the soils, and the City would review the proposal for compliance with the standards.

Board Member Rubenkönig suggested that maintenance agreements could offer another tool for ensuring that LID techniques are designed and maintained to function properly. She questioned if there is sufficient staff to regularly check each situation. Mr. Shuster pointed out that the City routinely inspects to make sure that conventional stormwater systems are constructed to meet the code requirements, and they try to do the same with rain gardens. However, he felt they could probably do a better job. Board Member Rubenkönig suggested that staff research how other jurisdictions address design and maintenance issues.

Board Member Robles recalled that many years ago, the energy code required that buildings be sealed tight, which caused buildings to rot from the inside out because they retained moisture. He cautioned that there may be unintended consequences associated with some of the LID techniques. For example, if the ground absorbs too much water, it may infiltrate into the foundation of a structure. If a roof garden is not done right, it can result in leaks. He stressed the need to require that designs be stamped by a professional at every opportunity to ensure that LID techniques are done right and function properly.

Board Member Robles observed that the documents related to stormwater are large, and he reminded the Board that the City's intent is to create a condensed version of the stormwater management documents that is simple and more user friendly. Developers could still review to the more detailed documents for additional information. Mr. Shuster agreed that is the intent.

## **OVERVIEW OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

Mr. Chave advised that part of the 2014 Comprehensive Plan update will include integrating performance measures into the various plan elements. Preferably, there would be just one measure per plan element that tries to capture what is important to the public. He recalled that the Board did some work on the subject in 2010, but the measures were complex and difficult to implement. The staff and Planning Board has discussed the issue again in recent months and concurred that it is important that the performance measures be meaningful for the community, relevant to the particular element, related to the specific

goals and policies in the element, easy to gather information and report on and something that can be summarized and communicated effectively. Examples include:

- Permitting activity
- Annual registration for park related events and programs
- Air quality information available from the Puget Sound Air Quality Agency
- Energy measures available from the Snohomish County Public Utility District and/or Puget Sound Energy
- Water quality measures such as those reported by the City on an annual basis
- Sidewalk construction/rehabilitation projects as reported by the Public Works Department

Mr. Chave emphasized that the goal is to have a variety of measures tied to different plan chapters or sections. However, they must be comparable and easy for staff to assemble on an annual basis. The performance standards would allow the Planning Board and City Council to review the plan's performance each year.

Mr. Chave advised that there are a number of statements throughout the Comprehensive Plan that call out actions. These are general statements with no timeline attached. The goal is to identify at least some of these actions and add dates and/or milestones to give them more definition. He said staff has reviewed the Board's previous work on performance measures, and a summary was provided in the Staff Report. They have also had internal discussions about potential performance measures and action items. He plans to bring back more specific ideas at subsequent meetings.

Board Member Lovell referred to the list of performance measures that would be easy to track and asked if it would be possible for staff to gather information from other departments. Mr. Chave agreed that the intent is to tap into the resources that are already available. He stressed the importance of starting simple and not trying to take on too much. The key is to figure out what is already available that they can report on without spending a tremendous amount of effort. They should start with an easy-to-understand report card that means something. If the initial measures are successful, more can be added over time.

Board Member Lovell asked if it is staff's intent to identify dates for one or two action items in each plan element to help prioritize the work program. Mr. Chave agreed that is the intent. Board Member Lovell pointed out that many of the action items in the Strategic Action Plan can be directly linked to action items in the Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Hope agreed there will be some cross over between the Strategic Action Plan and the Comprehensive Plan.

Board Member Robles noted that many of the performance measures identified earlier by the Board are considered intangible and difficult to measure, such as how many people attend fairs and facilities. It is important to keep in mind that there are data sites that provide tools to measure this type of intangible activity.

Board Member Stewart said she tends to want to review the Comprehensive Plan elements to get an idea of the categories that might have measurable indicators. She thought perhaps it would be helpful to coordinate their efforts with the work being done to update the Climate Change Action Plan. There may also be some good ideas in the summary staff prepared of the Board's previous work. In the meantime, the Board should think about indicators that are understandable, communicate results to the community, easy to measure, and easy to obtain information. Mr. Chave said staff would bring back some suggestions that are tied to specific elements for the Board's continued discussion. Initially, they will not be able to tackle measures that are analytical and require the staff to hunt for data.

Vice Chair Tibbott suggested it would be appropriate to have at least two performance measures for the Transportation Element to address both roadways and walkways. Again, Mr. Chave suggested they start with at least one performance measure for each element and then the program can grow over time.

Vice Chair Tibbott asked if identifying performance measures for each Comprehensive Plan element will involve a public process. Mr. Chave advised that there will be numerous public hearings over the course of the Comprehensive Plan update. These hearings will allow the Board to solicit input from the public regarding each of the elements, including potential performance measures. In addition, the concept could also be outlined in the City's quarterly newsletter, and the public could be invited to provide input.

Board Member Stewart commented that the Sustainability Element identifies climate change, community health, and environmental quality as a lens through which the City takes a broader look at the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Chave observed that the Sustainability Element is a key component of the Comprehensive Plan. As it is somewhat nontraditional, it may require a different type of measure. It will take some careful thought to figure out what is actually measurable. Again, Board Member Robles commented that there are ways to measure the intangible.

Board Member Lovell observed that identifying performance measures in conjunction with updating the Comprehensive Plan will demonstrate that the City wants to make the Comprehensive Plan a reality. Ms. Hope agreed that it is important to demonstrate the City's desire to implement the Comprehensive Plan by providing a meaningful way to measure its progress on an annual basis. The hard part is figuring out what the City has control over versus what is influenced by a larger region. For example, the sustainability element will have a broader base, as air and water quality are impacted by areas outside of Edmonds.

### **REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA**

Mr. Chave announced that a public hearing on the Capital Facilities Plan Element Update is scheduled for September 24<sup>th</sup>. It is anticipated that copies of the draft plan will be sent out well in advance of the public hearing, and Board Members will be invited to provide feedback, comments and questions. Staff will not make a preliminary presentation prior to the public hearing.

Vice Chair Tibbott requested an update on the Five Corners Plan. Mr. Chave replied that the Five Corners Plan is on hold pending the outcome of Westgate Plan. It is anticipated that the City Council's actions regarding the Westgate Plan will inform what they want to do with the Five Corners Plan.

Vice Chair Tibbott also requested an update on Development Code amendments related to Highway 99. Mr. Chave reviewed that the Board forwarded a recommendation to the City Council regarding proposed amendments related to Highway 99. In addition, the proposed 2015 budget includes funding for a consultant to study options for a planned action on Highway 99 that would push forward the idea of transit-oriented development nodes. If this funding is not approved, they will have to do what they can at the Planning Board and staff level. He reminded the Board that having a plan in place would give the City an advantage in obtaining grant funding for improvements along Highway 99. However, it is difficult to obtain funding for planning.

Vice Chair Tibbott announced that Board Member Duncan has submitted his resignation. Mr. Chave said the Mayor's office is in the process of advertising the vacant position.

Vice Chair Tibbott inquired if the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Department would be providing a report to the Board before the end of the year. Mr. Chave agreed to contact the Director to schedule a report on the Board's extended agenda.

### **PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS**

Vice Chair Tibbott said he regularly drives through the Five Corners intersection and has been amazed at how well traffic has moved through during construction of the roundabout. He commended the City for keeping the roadway open throughout a very rigorous construction schedule.

### **PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS**

Board Member Ellis encouraged Board Members to patronize the businesses at Five Corners as often as possible, as the construction disruptions do harm the businesses.

Board Member Stewart announced that the City is sponsoring a Volunteer Picnic on August 24<sup>th</sup> from 2:00 to 4:00 p.m. at City Park. Board Members each received invitations via email, and the City would like them to RSVP by the end of the week. Board Members can contact Council Member Johnson for more information. She said she attended the picnic last year. It was well done, and she enjoyed the opportunity to talk with other City volunteers in a social setting.

**APPROVED**

Board Member Stewart reminded the Board of the open house sponsored by the Tree Board on August 14<sup>th</sup> from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. in the Library Plaza Room. She explained that the Tree Board is working on the Tree Code update, as well as the Heritage Tree Program. The open house is an opportunity for citizens to comment and help with the plans. She encouraged interested Board Members to attend.

Board Member Lovell noted that he did not attend the Board's last meeting, but he read the minutes. He said he wholeheartedly supports the motions that were approved and the recommendations that were forwarded to the City Council related to Highway 99.

Board Member Lovell thanked Board Members Rubenkonig and Robles for volunteering to fill in for him at the August 20<sup>th</sup> Economic Development Commission Meeting, which he cannot attend because he will be attending a workshop sponsored by Northwest Sustainable Energy for Economic Development (Northwest SEED). The workshop will focus on an initiative called "Solarize South County," which is designed to help single-family homeowners and small businesses purchase solar equipment via a streamlined process and group discount. Participants at the workshop can learn about the technical and economic aspects of solar energy. He said he has been invited to provide a testimonial about the solar installation he just completed on his home. He summarized that the costs are about a third of what they were 10 years ago, and his system should pay for itself within six years.

Board Member Robles referred to the attachments provided in the Staff Report related to performance measures (Sustainability Element and Sample of Previous Planning Board Work on Indicators). He agreed that the Sustainability Element should be an overarching foundational document for other work the Board does.

Board Member Robles asked what Board Members should do when approached by members of the public with input regarding the Planning Division and Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Department. Mr. Chave encouraged Board Members to pass the information on.

Board Member Rubenkonig reported on her attendance at the last City Council Meeting where the draft Westgate Plan was discussed. Recognition was given to the large number of citizens involved in the process over the past four years. At the request of Board Member Rubenkonig, Mr. Chave reviewed the opportunities that were provided for public input throughout the process. He summarized that a lot of people were aware of and pleased with the process. The City received letters from people who testified at the hearings complimenting the Board. They felt they were listened to and were pleased with the discussion and outcome from the Board. This speaks well for how the Board handled the process.

Mr. Chave noted that the Economic Development Commission instigated the Westgate and Five Corners planning processes, and they prepared a white paper outlining the public process for the Westgate Plan. There was unanimous support for the Westgate Plan amongst the original Commissioners, and nearly unanimous support from the current Commissioners. Board Member Rubenkonig observed that a lot of eyes have reviewed and critiqued the plan on behalf of the City.

Board Member Rubenkonig advised that she served on the exploratory committee for creating a Metropolitan Park District in Edmonds. While the City decided not to move the concept forward at this time, the conversation has not ended. She noted that the City of Seattle recently passed an initiative to create a Metropolitan Park District.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

The Board meeting was adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

**APPROVED**