

DRAFT
Subject to January 28th Approval

CITY OF EDMONDS
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

January 14, 2015

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 – 5th Avenue North.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Neil Tibbott, Chair
Philip Lovell, Vice Chair
Bill Ellis
Daniel Robles
Valerie Stewart
Mike Nelson
Evan Zhao, Student Representative

STAFF PRESENT

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager
Carrie Hite, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT

Todd Cloutier
Careen Rubenkonig

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

VICE CHAIR LOVELL MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 10, 2014 BE APPROVED AS AMENDED. BOARD MEMBER NELSON SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

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 REPORT TO PLANNING BOARD

Chair Tibbott referred to the written report provided by the development Services Director.

Vice Chair Lovell requested more information about the Comprehensive Plan Open House that is scheduled for February 25, 2015 from 5:00 to 7:00 p.m., preceding the Board's regular meeting. Mr. Chave explained that, rather than a public hearing, the meeting would be an open house to provide information regarding the Comprehensive Plan update. People in attendance can learn about the process, provide feedback, and sign up to receive additional information as the process moves forward.

Board Member Stewart asked if the Comprehensive Plan page on the City's website is strictly informational or interactive. Mr. Chave answered that it allows an opportunity for the public to provide feedback. He noted that the City now has a Facebook Page where people can provide comments, as well.

Board Member Stewart complimented staff on the Building Division Report, which is very informative and shows the progress made throughout the year. At the request of Board Member Stewart, Mr. Chave provided clarification of the Chart on Page 1 regarding the actual number of additional residential units. He explained that alteration and/or addition projects did not increase the number of units available in the City. However, new units were added as part of new construction. In particular, he noted that the chart provides an estimate of the number of new units associated with the mixed use project.

Board Member Robles requested more information about how the total dollar valuation is calculated. In particular, he asked why the valuation number for the 2,329 mechanical/plumbing permits was zero. He noted that if \$74 million is being used as a reference or datum, then how the number is calculated should be transparent. Mr. Chave explained that fees for mechanical and plumbing permits are based on the number of fixtures and are not usually valuation driven. Typically, mechanical and plumbing permits are done along with overall permits for new commercial and/or multi-family development. If fees for plumbing and mechanical permits were based on the total valuation, as well, the City would actually be double counting.

Board Member Nelson asked if the City has plans to notify the public that they can now watch the Planning Board Meetings on television or on line. Mr. Chave said he anticipates an announcement will be made to the public.

Chair Tibbott referenced the Social Media Policy, which was attached to the Director's Report. Mr. Chave said the City Attorney has advised that members of the City Council, Boards and Commissions should visit the site to be informed, but they should avoid direct interaction. He emphasized that the Facebook Page is not intended to duplicate the City's website. It is intended to provide another avenue for information that is friendlier and less formal, and the more formal information will remain on the City's website. The Board can feed information they want posted on the site, but it must be City related. He further advised that the Facebook Page is moderated by several City departments. The Board agreed it would be helpful to have a more in-depth discussion regarding the policy at a future date. It was noted that suggestions for potential changes to the Social Media Policy would need to be presented to the City Council for consideration.

DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION FOR GENERAL AND LAND USE ELEMENTS OF 2015 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE

Mr. Chave advised that an open house is scheduled for February 25th. At that time, staff will provide information about the overall process for updating the Comprehensive Plan and what its purpose is. A lot of information will be available at that time, and he anticipates that transportation will figure prominently in the discussion because it is one of the more important updates. Chair Tibbott asked if the Board will have completed its discussion on all of the elements of the Comprehensive Plan before the open house. Mr. Chave answered that most of the important elements will have been covered by then. However, the Board may not see the Transportation Element prior to the open house. This element is still a work in progress, but it is hoped it is far enough along by the open house to provide background information to the public.

Chair Tibbott noted that after the open house, the various elements will come back to the Board for public hearings. He asked if the Board would have one public hearing on all of the elements or if they would hold separate hearings on each element. Mr. Chave said that would be up to the Board to decide. He said it is anticipated the Board will forward a recommendation to the City Council sometime in the Spring, with a target date for adoption by the end of June. He reminded the Board that their review is running in tandem with the Council's review of the various elements.

Board Member Stewart pointed out that, as per the extended agenda, the Board's first public hearing on the Comprehensive Plan update is scheduled for June 10th. It appears that the City Council will conduct a public hearing on each of the elements prior to the Board's hearing. Mr. Chave said the Development Services Director did not anticipate the City Council would want to have hearings during the initial stage, but the City Council decided to hold a public hearing before discussing each element. He said it would be good if the Planning Board could complete their public hearing process and forward a recommendation to the City Council before the tentative June 10th date.

Vice Chair Lovell referred to the 1st sentence in the 2nd paragraph on Page 12 of the General Background Section (Attachment 1) and questioned if it is appropriate to include a reference to the “economy recovering from the recession. He reminded the Board that the role of the Comprehensive Plan is to provide a general vision and guidelines as opposed to being too specific. He recalled the Board’s previous discussions about keeping the Comprehensive Plan simple and straightforward. The Board agreed to eliminate this sentence.

Board Member Stewart noted that the regional Vision 2040 Plan paints the City in the context of being in a beautiful environment, and she does not believe this is emphasized enough in the Comprehensive Plan. She said she reviewed the General Background Section and the Land Use Element again and identified a number of changes that would incorporate language from Vision 2040 regarding the natural environment, the amenities that attract people to the City to live and visit, and the need to protect what they have. She read the opening statement of the Vision 2040 document and stressed the importance of making sure the language in the Comprehensive Plan adequately discusses the need for maintaining a healthy environment and maintaining what the City already has. The Comprehensive Plan should appreciate the City’s amazing setting and integrate it into its future plans. As an example of the type of changes she is proposing, she shared the following new language for the 4th paragraph on Page 10 of the General Introduction Section (Attachment 1) that expands upon the assets the City cherishes and wants to protect into the future:

The City of Edmonds was incorporated in 1890 with the original town site encompassing approximately 550 acres including lush forests and 5 miles of beautiful shoreline along Puget Sound. The City of Edmonds was a well-established community by the turn of the century, and the present urban form preserves many characteristics of its historic origins. The community’s location on the west-facing slopes of Puget Sound provides many amenities including extensive views of the water and mountains, with access to beaches and waterfront parks. The original town site is now occupied primarily by the downtown and adjacent residential areas, but all encompassing of the magnificent and natural environment. The city has expanded in area through annexations to approximately 9.1 square miles.

Board Member Robles agreed with Board Member Stewart’s proposed changes in principle. There are numerous statements in the Land Use Element about the need to stay within the intended form and function of the City and/or that the architectural standard needs to be within the character of the City. However, there is nothing in the Comprehensive Plan that clearly defines what the character of Edmonds is. The additional language put forward by Board Member Stewart could provide a backdrop for this information. The remainder of the Board concurred.

The Board agreed that the best approach would be to send the General Introduction Section and Land Use Element forward to the City Council as currently written, with the additional changes identified tonight. However, it should be understood that they are unfinished documents that the Board will continue to revise. They invited Board Member Stewart to forward her proposed changes to staff for dissemination amongst the Board Members. The Board Members could review the changes and forward appropriate comments to staff in preparation for a continued discussion at a future meeting. Mr. Chave agreed to review the extended agenda and identify a date for the Board’s continued discussion, as well as a deadline for submitting written comments.

Chair Tibbott commented that he found the historical background contained in the General Introductory Section to be very interesting and well put together. He felt the need to alert other citizens of Edmonds about the information because it is very valuable in terms of understanding the history of the City.

Vice Chair Lovell referred to Page 57 of the Land Use Element (Attachment 4), which talks about activity centers. He noted that the verbiage indicates there are two activity centers in Edmonds, but it does not indicate where the activity centers are located. He asked if this sentence refers specifically to the Downtown/Waterfront and Medical/Highway 99 Activity Centers and not the neighborhood centers. Mr. Chave said it is intended to refer to the two activity centers, and perhaps it would be appropriate to specifically call them out at the end of the sentence. He explained that the two activity centers is where the City anticipates the most intensive and walkable areas in the City will be located. Because there is good transit service in these areas, it is anticipated they will experience more change than the neighborhood centers, which are fairly limited by geography and historical development.

Vice Chair Lovell referred to the framework goals that activity centers in Edmonds are intended to address (Pages 57 and 58 of Attachment 4) and asked if these same framework goals would apply to the neighborhood centers, as well. Mr. Chave said they would apply to some degree, but they are intended to be specific to the activity centers. Vice Chair Lovell observed that language related to Five Corners and other neighborhood centers can be found in other sections of the Comprehensive Plan.

Vice Chair Lovell referred to Downtown/Waterfront Goals B and C (Page 62 of Attachment A), which both make reference to Edmonds Crossing at Point Edwards. He asked if Edmonds Crossing is still a viable project or if its reference should be removed from the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Chave answered that the Edmonds Crossing Project at Point Edwards continues to be the City's expressed desire. While there are questions about funding and when the project might move forward, the City has not expressed a desire or conclusion that it should not be a goal. He cautioned that the City should approach this project carefully with a detailed, thorough evaluation of alternatives. Because of the history of documents and reports and the multi-jurisdictional partnerships, it is not a decision the City would want to take lightly on its own.

Mr. Chave pointed out that changes were made throughout the Downtown/Waterfront Plan to address the community's desire to pursue emergency access over the tracks and to support transit facilities in the downtown. He summarized that while the City does not want to give up on Edmonds Crossing at Point Edwards, having a little more language in the Comprehensive Plan about these shorter-term goals would be appropriate. Vice Chair Lovell said he supports the language, as drafted, which adequately and clearly addresses the need to solve problems such as ferry queuing and emergency access over the railroad tracks.

Vice Chair Lovell noted that Downtown/Waterfront Goals B and C (Page 62 of Attachment 4) also mention the Port of Edmonds Master Plan. He asked if the Port currently has an up-to-date master plan. Mr. Chave answered affirmatively. He recalled previous discussions about whether or not the Comprehensive Plan should continue to adopt the Port's Master Plan by reference. In either case, it is not part of the materials the Commission is considering at this time.

Mr. Chave pointed out another subtle change on Page 70 of Attachment 4. Staff is recommending that the timeline (5 to 7 years) for short-term actions be eliminated. He explained that, at this time, the City does not know what the actual time frame for the short-term actions will be. Vice Chair Lovell said he supports the additional short-term action (Item 1 on Page 70 of Attachment 4), which calls for developing a short-term plan and strategy to address transportation conflicts and safety issues involving the interaction of rail, ferry, vehicular and pedestrian traffic in the waterfront area. Mr. Chave noted that the last sentence in Item 3 on Page 70 of Attachment 4 was also updated to read, "during the short-term planning period, evaluate the feasibility and benefits of retaining a commuter rail and transit presence after the construction of Edmonds Crossing."

Chair Tibbott asked if the proposed language provides enough clarity for planning purposes. Mr. Chave answered affirmatively. He explained that the intent is to provide a sense of what the overall direction will be without necessarily detailing the conclusion.

Board Member Robles said the language on Page 48 of Attachment 4 makes it appear as though the City is changing the way useable land is calculated. If that is the case, the document should also make note of the previous method. Mr. Chave said no changes are being proposed to the method of calculating useable land. He cautioned against providing too much detail of this type in a planning document. Board Member Robles agreed, but suggested that the language should make it clear that no changes were made.

Board Member Robles referred to Page 53 of Attachment 4 and asked how the term "employment is defined." Mr. Chave answered that the term refers to all employment that is tracked and defined by the State Office of Financial Management. He explained that the City does not do its own independent study. The State tracks businesses licenses and the information is funneled to the Puget Sound Regional Council to be sorted out by jurisdiction.

Board Member Robles said he supports the 1st bulleted item on Page 60 of Attachment 4, which calls out the increased concern about conflicts and safety issues related to the interaction of rail, ferry, vehicular and pedestrian traffic. However, he suggested that the statement should also identify the need for emergency response infrastructure. He noted that even a simple derailment could block access across the tracks for hours and people could be stuck on the other side. Mr. Chave agreed that this is one of the issues that should be studied when trying to resolve safety problems, and the Council has had discussions with staff about ideas, short of doing a physical connection, such as having some sort of aid presence on the

waterfront, itself, so there is emergency response available independent of the ability to cross the tracks. Obviously, there would be a cost associated with this concept, but it is within the realm of options that will be looked at.

Vice Chair Lovell pointed out that the 3rd bulleted item on Page 61 was changed to add a sentence about resolving transportation conflicts and safety issues involving the interaction of rail, ferry, vehicular and pedestrian traffic. Board Member Robles expressed concern that the language does not specifically call out emergency response. Mr. Chave suggested that “safety” would include emergency response, as well. He reminded the Board that the thrust of the policies is to call out the problems and the need to address them, but not to assume or guess what the solution will be.

Student Representative Zhao observed that there are currently emergency towers on the terminal side of the tracks. Pressing the button on the tower activates the emergency system and a light goes on. He suggested it would be helpful to have these towers on both sides of the tracks. He noted that the towers were originally designed for personal safety on college campus. Board Member Robles said this would not solve issues related to emergency response, which is not trivial. He suggested that, at the very least, there should be defibrillators on the water side of the tracks. Mr. Chave agreed and said all of these ideas could be discussed as part of the safety issue.

Board Member Robles referred to the bulleted list of components of the overall vision of the downtown/waterfront area on Page 60 of Attachment 4. He noted that that this section includes very little regarding electric charging stations and technology such as public WiFi, bike sharing, and auxiliary use of smart phones to gain data transport. He suggested that additional language related to technology would be appropriate in this section.

Board Member Robles noted that a lot of language was removed from the Land Use Element starting on Page 78 of Attachment 4. Mr. Chave said the language is related to design, and was moved to the Urban Design Element of the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Chave also noted that references to water resources and drainage management on Page 114 of Attachment 4 were eliminated because they are already addressed in the Stormwater Element. Including them in the Land Use Element would be conflicting and repetitive.

Board Member Robles raised a concern that Item C.3 on Page 94 of Attachment 4 may not be adequate to create sufficient buffers between higher density and adjoining residential neighborhoods. He specifically referred to Highway 99, where there is an underrepresented population that will endure a fairly stout amount of development. There are opportunities to use innovations such as green walls, urban farms and other sustainable resources as a transition between the active zones and the residential communities. Board Member Lovell pointed out that Item C.2 on Page 94 of Attachment 4 has more specific language about transition and was added to address the concerns Board Member Robles brought forward at the last meeting. Board Member Robles agreed that the new language in Item C.2 adequately addresses his concern.

Board Member Stewart referred to Table 6 on Page 42 of Attachment 3 and asked what is meant by the term “nominal change.” Mr. Chave explained that “nominal change” is a mathematical term. Nominal is numeric. The number for nominal change in the 2010 column represents the difference between 2000 and 2010, and the number for nominal change in the 2035 column represents the difference between 2010 and 2035. However, the number for nominal change in the 2000 column has no reference and probably referred to an earlier count. It should probably be changed to a dash. He agreed to review this table and see if can be made clearer.

Board Member Stewart asked if the bulleted items on Page 43 of Attachment 3 were taken from the Vision 2040 Plan. Mr. Chave answered that the only reference to the Vision 2040 Plan is the general reference to the activity center concept. There is no connection between the framework goals (bulleted list) and the Vision 2040 Plan. The list is intended to provide a description of what the City is trying to do in activity centers in Edmonds. He explained that the activity centers in Edmonds do not really track with the regional centers and other higher-ordered centers that are called out in Vision 2040. While they are consistent with the concept of having some sort of pedestrian, transit-oriented development in the City, they are at a different scale than the significant centers called out in Vision 2040.

Board Member Stewart recommended that bicycle mobility should be specifically called out in the Comprehensive Plan. She recalled that the Board has discussed the concept of complete streets and some of the overarching vision in the Comprehensive Plan talks about the ability to move around and stay healthy, as well as connectivity.

Board Member Stewart recalled that at their last meeting, it was noted that the City Council's discussion regarding the Senior Center included the concept of the facility becoming a senior center/community center. Because discussions regarding the concept have been robust, she felt it would be prudent to include a reference in the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Chave recalled that the Board previously agreed it would be premature to include the concept at the Comprehensive Plan level before the senior center process has run its course. He noted that the Comprehensive Plan could be amended in the future to incorporate the concept, if appropriate.

Student Representative Zhao noted that Table 6 on Page 55 of Attachment 4 is intended to replace Table 7 on Page 56 of Attachment 4. The first data point on Table 7 is 1990, but the 1990 data was eliminated from Table 6. He suggested that Board Member Stewart's concern could be resolved by putting the 1990 figures back in. Mr. Chave agreed that would be the easiest way to make the table clearer. However, he cautioned that the 1990 figures can be misleading because the City experienced a lot of annexation in the late 1990's.

Mr. Chave reminded the Board that the plan is to review Board Member Stewart's proposed changes and then schedule a continued discussion at a future meeting.

EDMONDS PARKS, RECREATION AND CULTURAL SERVICES PLANNING BOARD REPORT

Ms. Hite presented the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services report, specifically noting the following:

- **Five Corners Roundabout Artwork.** The roundabout is now open and it is beautiful and includes an art element that was created by a local artist and selected by the Arts Commission through a public process. It has some blue lighting that is supposed to depict opening up to the waterfront. They are very happy with the artwork and have heard great comments from the community.
- **4th Avenue Cultural Corridor.** Based on the Community Cultural Plan, the City has been working the Arts Commission on some temporary art installments that might help bring visibility to the corridor short of getting a grant for \$5 million to actually complete the corridor improvements. The plan is to incorporate a few elements this year and see how they are received by the community. She provided pictures and explained the concepts, which include parklets, crosswalk installments, etc.
- **Edmonds Downtown Cultural Heritage Tour.** The tour is up and running and people have been using it. The actual signage and stories are located mostly in downtown and tell a lot of the history of Edmonds. She encouraged the Board Members to take the opportunity to check them out.
- **SR 99 International District Enhancement Project.** The lanterns and banners were installed in the International District during the past year, and staff will continue to work with the Engineering Department to do more work on SR 99.
- **Flower Basket Poles.** A total of 22 poles with unique art elements have been installed in downtown Edmonds and a walking map is available on the website and at the Francis Anderson Center. The existing poles are rusted and bent, but they are still functional and safe. The goal is to replace all of the poles over the next two years. The program has received rave reviews from the community.
- **Edmonds Marsh/Marina Beach Master Plan.** The Parks Department is working with the Stormwater Division on a project to daylight Willow Creek, and 30% of the design and feasibility work has been completed. The City recently received another grant for \$160,000 to complete 60% design and begin the permitting work. However, in order to get to 60% design detail, it is necessary to figure out where Willow Creek is going to out lie on Marina Beach Park. The City hired consultant, Shannon Wilson, to conduct a study on two possible alternatives: one through the southern portion of the beach property through what is known as the off-leash area and the other through the northern portion of the property over the green hill and through the parking lot? The City has also hired consulting firm, Walker Macy Architects, to help the City through the master plan process for Marina Beach Park. The consulting team will consider the two options, as well as alternatives that might be better for the park. A project advisory committee has been formed to work with the consultant to walk the community through the master plan process. She pointed out that Marina Beach Park has never

been master planned; it was just created. This process will provide an opportunity for the City to work with the community on the outfall of Willow Creek, as well as creating some environmental and educational pieces with the salmon and pedestrian walks over the creek. The process will identify the components of the park that the community still loves and wants to retain, as well as new components. Once the master plan is completed in draft form, it will be presented to the Planning Board for review and a public hearing. The goal is for the City Council to approve the master plan, including the outfall and alignment of Willow Creek, so the City can proceed to the 60% design level and the move towards 90% design and construction. She said she anticipates a three to five year time span for the projected to be completed.

Vice Chair Lovell asked if salmon habitat was included as part of the Willow Creek study. Ms. Hite answered that the channels identified in the study by Shannon Wilson have been shown to be very attractive for salmon to come back into the marsh. She explained that the study and project has a dual purpose of creating the natural habitat again, but also containing stormwater to reduce flooding problems on SR-104.

Chair Tibbott asked if the off-leash area is considered part of Marina Beach Park, and Ms. Hite answered affirmatively. Chair Tibbott asked if the off-leash park could be maintained if there is a creek channel running through it. Ms. Hite said it could be maintained, but it might be smaller and/or have a different look. Prospective consultants for the master plan were asked to share their preliminary innovative ideas for incorporating the creek outfall into Marina Beach Park. The consulting firm that was hired provided two dynamic designs that would introduce educational and natural elements to the park, but continue to maintain the existing components. Chair Tibbott asked if would make sense, under some circumstances, to maintain the off-leash park in its current location. Ms. Hite said it could. She noted that there has been a lot of discussion about the environmental impact of dogs on the beach, there is also a large contingent of Edmonds residents who love the dog park in its current location. It will be up to the public to guide the process and then the Planning Board and City Council to decide what is best for the community.

- **Yost Pool.** This pool is one of the gems of the community, and several capital projects have taken place over the past few years. The boiler was replaced in 2014, which resulted in a significant savings in utility bills and allowed the pool to operate much more efficiently. The plan is to replace the spa in 2015. The spa has had continual problems, but it is popular amongst the community given the cold mornings when people come for lap swimming and lessons. The City entered into a partnership with the YMCA in 2014 to provide lifeguards and swim instructors. For the first time in the history of the pool, it finished the year in the positive financially. The City provided the registration platform and programming, and the YMCA ran the program. They are currently in discussions with the YMCA for the 2015 season, and the YMCA has indicated a desire to run the entire pool, including maintenance.
- **City Park Spray Pad Design.** The playground equipment at City Park was replaced in 2014. However, they ran into some technical issues related to the spray pad, and the City hired consultant Site Workshop to redesign the project. The consultant was able to resolve the technical issues and the permits were issued on December 2nd. The City will go out to bid for the spray equipment next week and advertise for construction bids in two to three weeks. The goal is to break ground in March with completion by Memorial Day. However, she acknowledged that the project may not be completed until mid June. She emphasized that the project has received a lot of community and grant support (\$500,000 grant from the Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO), \$270,000 from the Hazel Miller Foundation, \$80,000 from Snohomish County, and the City paid for the remainder of the \$1.3 million project). The new play equipment was installed last June by a group of over 80 volunteers who worked hard over a three-day weekend.
- **Dayton Street Plaza.** Demolition work for this project will begin next week, and funds have been set aside for its completion in 2015. The plaza will be located outside of the old Public Works Building on 2nd and Dayton, and the designs were done by Barker Landscape several years ago. The plaza is meant to be a draw for people to enjoy the plaza but also a resting point for those walking from downtown to the waterfront.
- **Park Impact Fees.** In 2013 park impact fees were assessed at 50%, and starting in October of 2014 the assessment was at 100%. It is projected that at the end of 2015, the City will have between \$500,000 and \$600,000 to invest in parks that will help address the increased demand associated with growth.

- **Former Woodway High School Development.** This project is currently under design and will break ground in 2015. The City secured a \$750,000 grant from the State and a \$2.5 million grant from Verdant Health Care. The City and Edmonds School District are each contributing \$500,000. The total cost of Phase I of the project is \$4.2 million. The emphasis is to create a health and wellness site at the former high school. It is a destination site where parking is already available and no additional impervious surface would be needed. There is a dedicated driveway in place and the site is surrounded by trees and a buffer. The project would create two, multi-use, full-sized turf fields. Although lighting was originally part of a later phase, but the City is hoping to include it in Phase I. The beauty of turf fields is that they can be used year round. Without lights, it would be hard to use them after 5:00 p.m. in the winter. She is currently working on a partnership with the school district that would allow the City to give the district \$500,000 for the project. It would also give the City scheduling rights, as well as the maintenance responsibility for the fields.
- **Museum Plaza.** This is a city-owned building that is leased to the museum. The Edmonds South Snohomish County Historical Society is planning to develop a community plaza in front of the museum entry, and they have provided a rough schematic drawing of their plans. City staff will work with the Society to move the project forward. She noted that the inside of the building was recently restored. Chair Tibbott asked if there are any restrictions due to the historic nature of the building. Mr. Chave said the structure is the former Carnegie Library and is listed on the Edmonds Register of Historic Places. Any changes must go through the Historic Preservation Commission for a Certificate of Appropriateness. The Commission's charge is to review changes to ensure that the historic integrity of the building remains intact. He advised that the preliminary concept was recently presented to the Historic Preservation Commission and received positive review. However, some modifications will be made based on feedback from the Commission.
- **Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PROS) Plan and Community Cultural Plan.** Updates to both of these plans were recently adopted. The PROS Plan incorporates a new chapter on habitat and open space, as well as a new chapter talking about park foundations in metropolitan park districts. The robust plans will serve as a guide for the next six years.
- **Cemetery.** The City will be researching and planning for a cemetery mapping project in 2016. At this time, the cemetery is not marked or mapped, and the project is an effort to bring the cemetery to a standard so it can be operated efficiently. Commissioner Robles suggested that an Edmonds app would be useful to provide an avenue for City information to be downloaded. Ms. Hite agreed and said the City is using QR codes around the city so people can take pictures and get information.
- **Community Garden.** The City is working with the Lutheran Church at Westgate, who hosted the community garden that opened in 2014. They are also working on plans to have a community garden on the north side of the Old Woodway High School site. Chair Tibbott recalled that the City previously identified Esperance Park as a possible community garden location. Ms. Hite said the City did have some discussion with Snohomish County, who was in the process of purchasing the school district property located to the south of Esperance Park. The purchase was completed in November and Snohomish County is currently working with the community to master plan the park. There has been a lot of community support for a community garden and/or off-leash park in this location. She noted that it is not within the City limits, but Edmonds residents are able to use the park and benefit from it.
- **Civic Stadium.** The City has had this acquisition in its Comprehensive Plan and PROS Plan for a number of years. Discussions with the school district have often failed, but now they are on the edge of possibly purchasing it. The City conducted an appraisal of the property and submitted an RCO grant for acquisition funds, but they will not know about the funds until May. The district is now performing its appraisal, and the goal is to complete the transaction in 2015. Board Member Nelson asked about the City's current plan for the Civic Center fields. Ms. Hite said it is a current asset to the City's Park system, and numerous activities already happen there. If acquired this year, \$100,000 has been set aside to master plan the park in 2016. It may be that the community wants to keep it the same, or there may be an interest in creating a key signature downtown park that has more walking areas, berms, etc. Some capital improvements are needed and the stadium is in significant disrepair and expensive to maintain.
- **Fishing Pier.** This facility is 35 years old. The City approached RCO with a grant application for \$1.3 million and the requests have scored high. They are also collaborating with the Department of Fish and Wildlife, which owns the pier that sits on Port property. The facility currently has a three-way partnership, and all parties have a vested interest in

continuing to maintain the pier as an asset in the park system. Some students from Edmonds Woodway High School have been asked to help solicit feedback from the community about what they would like to see on the pier, itself. While most of the work will be focused on the underneath portions of the pier, there are some funds to improve amenities for the users, as well. Board Member Stewart inquired about the timeline for the project, particularly the work done by the students. Ms. Hite said the City's original intent was to go out to bid and start project construction on June 1st. However, the Department of Fish and Wildlife would like to postpone the project until the actual grant funding is available in September. Because work during the winter months could impact the integrity of the repairs, the project will likely be pushed out to the spring of 2016. However, some of the above-grade repairs may move forward this summer.

- **Student Conservation Association.** The City has collaborated with the Student Conservation Association for the past few years to bring in 10 to 12 young people from the work/education program to help the City in the parks over the summer. The students get paid for their work, and the program is targeted to youth between 14 and 21. The Hazel Miller Foundation also supports the association's efforts. It is fun to see young people learn about and invest in the environment and the community. Board Member Nelson asked Ms. Hite to describe some of the work the youth have done. Ms. Hite said the spray pad at City Park required wetland mitigation along the west side of SR-104, and the youth completed the entire project.
- **Anderson Center Amphitheatre.** This is a gem in the community that is used quite a bit. The roof will be replaced in 2015 as it is in disrepair. The stage will be redone, as well. However, the footprint of the facility will remain the same.
- **Veteran's Plaza.** Based on a recommendation from the Planning Board, the City Council charged a community group with developing a design for a Veteran's Plaza located outside the Public Safety Building. This group has been working with the City and will present their preferred concept design to the City Council on January 20th. A public hearing is also scheduled for the same date. She explained that the intent of the design is to create a place rather than a thoroughfare between the parking area and City Hall and/or the Public Safety Building. The design includes a wall that would represent the five branches of the military, and the branches would be separated by water features. The walls would be about shoulder height. The current plaza area would be retained, as would the existing trees and landscaping. However, seating would be added. The wall in the garden area would also be reconfigured to make it a nice seating area that allows for people to reflect. The committee is very excited about the design.

Board Member Stewart asked if the project would result in more impervious surface. Ms. Hite answered no. Board Member Stewart pointed out that there are opportunities, such as rain gardens, to improve stormwater management over what currently exists. Ms. Hite agreed to consider options for improved stormwater management.

- **Recreation.** The recreation program had a great year in 2014, with a very successful health and fitness expo that was co-sponsored by the Edmonds School District. The Beach Ranger program continued and was actually expanded to its original hours prior to 2011. Approximately 100 people participated in the Street Scramble. The every-day programs were successful, as well; and enrollment is picking up from the recession. Pickle ball has been trending, and there is a large club in Edmonds. At the request of the club, the City striped two of the tennis courts at Yost Park for pickle ball, as well. They currently have four nets available, and they are excited to host a tournament in 2015.
- **Metropolitan Park District.** The Parks Department staff may revisit the issue of a Metropolitan Park District. A citizens' group previously presented a proposal to the City Council, which was approved and scheduled to go on the ballot. Because the budget forecast improved, the City Council subsequently decided against asking voters for more taxes. However, the budget forecast in coming years is not as positive, and there must be some discussion about what the community can do. One concept called out in the PROS Plan is the exploration of a Metropolitan Park District. She noted that the City of Seattle just recently passed a \$42 million program by a wide majority vote. About 90% of all parks levies and revenue packages put to voters across the state have passed, which makes it clear that people want parks and they are part of the quality of life. She encouraged the community to continue to discuss the option.
- **Park Naming Policy.** The Parks Department staff will work on a park naming policy in 2015.

Chair Tibbott asked for an update on the Sunset Avenue Walkway. Ms. Hite answered that the Public Works Department restriped the streets to identify walkways along Sunset Avenue without specific involvement from the Parks Department.

The Parks Department's interest would be developing the southern portion of Sunset Avenue so it is more inviting for people to sit and view the sound. She supports the bicycle/walkway trail. She said she leads the senior walking program, and every time they got to Sunset Avenue they ended up on a dirt path. By the end of the summer they were able to walk on cement on the view side. The project is controversial, and the intent is to gauge community feedback after the one-year trial period. Chair Tibbott asked if funding for the Sunset Avenue Walkway Project would come from the Parks or Public Works Budget. Ms. Hite said there are a number of funding options. However, parks funding and/or RCO grant funding would only be available if it is a dedicated trail with a division to a street. As currently configured, the walkway would not qualify.

Board Member Robles asked if the City has a stake in the Meadowdale Playfield turf project. Ms. Hite answered affirmatively. She explained that the City of Lynnwood is taking a lead on the project, and they have applied for grant funding. In addition, \$1 million from a recent school district bond is dedicated to the playfields. The City actually uses the playfields via a joint partnership with the school district and the City of Lynnwood. Lynnwood maintains the fields and the City of Edmonds helps pay for the maintenance. The City of Edmonds has set aside capital money to help with the turf project, and she anticipates that the fields will be replaced in 2016 or 2017. She noted that the City of Edmonds owns the Meadowdale Clubhouse and has plans to replace the play equipment this year. Board Member Robles asked if the City has plans to remodel the interior of the clubhouse, and Ms. Hite answered not at this time. Board Member Robles commented that it would be great to have an entry into the county park from Edmonds.

Board Member Stewart asked how much additional potable water would be required to operate the spray pad beyond what is used now. Ms. Hite said the proposed recirculating system would significantly reduce the amount of water needed to operate the facility. She noted that Edmonds would be the first spray pad in Snohomish County that uses a recirculating system rather than a direct-to-drain system. As proposed, the water would be chlorinated and recirculated to the site. Vice Chair Lovell suggested that educational signage be added near the spray pad to inform the public of the sustainable benefits of the proposed system.

Ms. Hite concluded her presentation by noting that the Parks Department staff is an incredible team, and they have accomplished a lot over the past year. They are passionate about their work and committed to Edmonds.

Chair Tibbott asked Ms. Hite to extend the Board's appreciation to the Parks Department staff. He also suggested that the written report should be published on the Planning Board's website.

DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION FOR UTILITIES ELEMENT OF 2015 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE

Mr. Chave explained that the Utilities Element covers potable water, sanitary sewer, storm and surface water management and solid waste. The goals and policies outlined in the Storm and Surface Water Management Section came directly from the Storm and Surface Water Management Plan that was more recently updated, and there is a reference to the plan where more detailed information is available. However, because there are no itemized goals and policies in the Potable Water and Sanitary Sewer Plans, the language in the respective sections is more narrative to reflect the language in the plans. When the two plans are updated in the future, they will be reformatted to be consistent with the Storm and Surface Water Management Plan. The Solid Waste Section contains essentially new language that replaces the old, dated language.

Board Member Stewart recalled discussions amongst the Mayor's Climate Protection Committee regarding recent staff and City Council discussions about developing a zero waste policy. She asked if this policy has evolved to the point it can be presented and incorporated into the Utilities Element. She expressed her belief that more work is needed on the Solid Waste Section. Mr. Chave noted that the section has been substantially written by Steve Fisher from Public Works, and it represents his best shot at what he understands the current direction to be. However, he acknowledged that the document could change based on ongoing discussions with the City Council regarding future programs.

Board Member Robles noted that the Solid Waste Section does not address items such as electronics, batteries, and light bulbs. While the law requires that these items be recycled at a specialized center, there is no incentive for people to do so and the items often wind up in the garbage. He acknowledged it is already difficult for utilities to receive two separate sets of garbage, and there may be resistance to accepting a third. However, he felt it is necessary.

Mr. Chave pointed out that Goal D on Page 99 of Attachment 1 actually addresses the concept of zero waste strategies. In addition, Goal C talks about toxic and other types of materials that are difficult to recycle. Board Member Nelson voiced support for Goal D, which calls for investigating policies and activities that will lead to development of a zero waste strategy.

Vice Chair Lovell referenced Goal C.3 on Page 142 of Attachment 2 and suggested it be changed to read, "Support programs that establish collection and recycling infrastructure for materials that are toxic, hazardous, hard-to-handle or under-recycled." Mr. Chave agreed to seek feedback from Mr. Fisher regarding this proposed change. He said he does not anticipate a problem with adding the word "hazardous," and he would also ask what "product stewardship initiatives" is intended to include as opposed to "program."

Board Member Stewart said her understanding is that the storm and surface water goals and policies will be rehashed in some fashion, zeroing in on water resources and drainage management. She asked if this discussion would also include green infrastructure techniques such as permeable pavement, rain gardens, and evapo-transportation practices. Mr. Chave agreed to forward the Board Members a link to the Storm and Surface Water Management Plan, which is also available via the City's website. He said his understanding from the stormwater engineer is that it includes extensive discussion about green infrastructure techniques.

Chair Tibbott asked to what extent the Utilities Element would connect with the Shoreline Management Program (SMP). Mr. Chave answered that there is a connection in a very general sense because there are utility facilities located within the shoreline area. There are goals and policies in the SMP that talk about the utilities, particularly about stormwater and natural features, and there is a lot of discussion in the SMP and Critical Area Regulations about promoting and protecting natural drainage systems, etc. However, the emphasis between the two documents is different. Chair Tibbott said he understands the emphasis is different, but he would not want one to override or be incompatible with the goals of the other. Mr. Chave did not believe that would be the case. He encouraged the Board Members to review the Storm and Surface Water Management Plan and forward their questions to the Stormwater Engineer.

Board Member Stewart announced that the group, Edmonds Woodway High School Students Saving Salmon, along with four partners (Sound Salmon Solutions, City of Edmonds, Earthcorp, and NOAA), have applied for a grant from the Fish and Wildlife Foundation to develop a water-quality testing program using students who are trained and supervised to do the monitoring. She expressed her belief that the program would support what needs to happen with regarding to monitoring water quality for humans and fish. At this time, they are looking to set up ten monitoring locations, and a walk will be scheduled to identify the good sites for water-quality testing. She invited Board Members to participate.

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

It was discussed that the Economic Development Element of the Comprehensive Plan is scheduled for Board review on January 28th. Vice Chair Lovell reported on his attendance at the December 17th meeting of the Economic Development Commission, at which the discussion focused on a draft of their recommended goals and policies for inclusion in the Economic Development Element of the Comprehensive Plan. This input will be incorporated into the document that is presented to the Board for review on January 28th. He summarized that the Commission identified five major goals: healthy business community, land use policies to support economic development, diversifying the city's economic make up, sustaining and attracting business and investment and expanding and enhancing the tourism sector of the City. He said he would attend the Commission's January 21st meeting and provide additional feedback to the Board.

Vice Chair Lovell said the Economic Development Commission also had a discussion about potential topics for more detailed study in 2015. The topics included: safety issues related to the railroad crossing, surveying current business/retail establishments, identifying areas where economic development can be promoted, engaging the Highway 99 businesses and working collaboratively with them, setting up a business-oriented website, analyzing and enhancing waterfront businesses, food trucks, creating a public gathering space, zoning changes to enhance economic development, Five Corners opportunities, boutique hotel in downtown, an EDC liaison program, items in the Strategic Action Plan and studying how to capture ferry traffic for greater tourism opportunity. He said he expects the Commission will narrow the list down in the next few months and establish subcommittees to study the issues further.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

Chair Tibbott requested a progress report on the City's effort to fill the vacant Planning Board position. Mr. Chave reported that staff is in the process of filling the position. Chair Tibbott encouraged Board Members to invite people they know to apply for the position.

Chair Tibbott said he continues to meet with the SR-104/Edmonds Way Study Group. It has been interesting to see and understand how the corridor functions. The study will be a valuable piece of information.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Board Member Nelson thanked the City Council for approving funds to videotape the Planning Board meetings. People have busy lives and cannot always attend meetings and/or read minutes on the website. He hopes it results in more public participation.

Vice Chair Lovell thanked Mr. Chave and his staff for incorporating the Board's comments into the Comprehensive Plan Elements. He also thanked Ms. Hite for providing a wonderful report on park projects. He highly recommended the Board Members read the latest issue the American Planning Magazine, which is primarily dedicated to the City of Seattle. He particularly referenced the article written by Mark Hinshaw titled, "What a Difference a Decade Makes."

Board Member Stewart announced an opportunity to attend a free class titled, "Be a Toxic Free Zone," sponsored by the Pacific Science Center. The class focuses on everyday products that people use and what to be aware of. The classes are scheduled for six Monday evenings at the Conference Center in Edmonds from 6:30 to 8:30 p.m. starting on January 26th.

ADJOURNMENT

The Board meeting was adjourned at 9:40 p.m.