

APPROVED APRIL 22ND

**CITY OF EDMONDS
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

April 8, 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
Todd Cloutier
Carreen Rubenkönig
Daniel Robles
Valerie Stewart
Matt Cheung
Evan Zhao, Student Representative

STAFF PRESENT

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager
Bertrand Hauss, Transportation Engineer
Rich Lindsey, Parks Maintenance Manager
Karin Noyes, Recorder

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT

Philip Lovell, Vice Chair

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER STEWART MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF MARCH 25, 2015 BE APPROVED AS AMENDED. BOARD MEMBER CLOUTIER SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS

There was no one in the audience.

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIRECTOR REPORT TO PLANNING BOARD

Chair Tibbott acknowledged the written report from the Development Services Director. There were no comments and questions from the Board Members relative to the report.

UPDATE ON DRAFT STREETScape AND STREET TREE PLANS

Mr. Chave reviewed that the Board last discussed the Streetscape and Streetscape section of the Community Culture and Urban Design Element on March 11th. At that time, they agreed to continue their discussion after the Tree Board met on April 2nd. They also requested that staff provide additional information to support the proposed changes in tree species. He reported that the Tree Board's meeting was postponed from April 2nd to April 9th, so they have not yet had an opportunity to

review the plan and provided feedback. However, he advised that Rich Lindsey, Parks Maintenance Manager, was present to address questions and provide additional information related to the proposed changes to street tree species.

Mr. Lindsey explained that the City's Street Tree Plan was originally adopted in 2002. Since that time, it has been determined that some of the species identified in the plan did not work well as street trees. For example, staff is proposing that the Columnar Sargent Cherry be replaced with Columnar Bowhall Maple. He explained that Columnar Bowhall Maples have proven to be very resilient, with brilliant spring, summer and fall colors. They are very low maintenance and disease and drought resistant, as well as slow growing and easy to prune and shape. They are also thornless, fruitless, resistant to pests, and the roots are non-invasive. They have done well in other areas of the City, and staff believes they would result in a cost savings from a maintenance point of view.

Mr. Lindsey said staff is also proposing to replace the Kwanson Flowering Cherry species. Although this species is beautiful in park-like settings, they do not make good street trees. Street trees must be pruned on a regular basis, and pruning of this species causes the trunk to become enlarged. In addition, the roots become aggressive and cause sidewalks to lift. These trees have done a lot of damage throughout the City. At the Tree Board's next meeting, he will propose that this species be replaced with Capital Pear, which is very similar to a Columnar Bowhall Maple. Capital Pear trees are very tough and have white flowers in the spring, shiny green leaves in the summer and red and purples leaves in the fall. They are draught and disease tolerant and resistant to breakage. They are also slow growing.

Chair Tibbott asked if staff could provide pictures of the species identified in the plan. He suggested the City Council would likely be very interested in seeking samples of the species of trees that are currently being recommended. He expressed appreciation for the work the staff and Tree Board have done to select trees that are compatible with the sidewalks, easy to maintain, etc.

Board Member Robles referred to the Columnar Sargent Maple Trees that are planted in front of City Hall, and noted that the sun conditions in this location are substantially different than in other areas of the City. The lack of morning and evening sun could tax any tree species. Mr. Lindsey agreed but said he believes the Columnar Bowhall Maple species have proven to be a good tree in any type of sun condition.

Board Member Rubenkonig recalled that, at their last discussion relative to the Street Tree Plan, it was noted that shopkeepers do not like a particular species of tree. She asked how members of the community can express their disinterest in a tree species. Mr. Lindsey said he deals with public complaints relative to street trees, especially pruning, on a regular basis. The goal is to select species that are hardy and slow growing so they do not disrupt pedestrian access or block views.

Chair Tibbott asked if Mr. Lindsey is confident that the recommended species will fit the maintenance criteria outlined for the City, will be compatible with surrounding vegetation, and will result in satisfactory landscaping design that fits the circumstances and can be approved by the City. Mr. Lindsey said he is comfortable that the proposed species meet all of these criteria.

Board Member Rubenkonig noted that the proposed Tree Code calls for the City to complete an Urban Forest Management Plan (UFMP) by the end of 2017. Mr. Chave said that is an action item included in the draft Tree Code. Board Member Rubenkonig said it seems out of sync to adopt a new Tree Code prior to the completion of the UFMP. Board Member Cloutier recalled that the Board previously indicated preference for completing the UFMP prior to adopting the new Tree Code. Chair Tibbott questioned if it would be acceptable for the Board to postpone any action on the draft Tree Code until a UFMP has been completed. Mr. Chave agreed that would be within the scope of what the Board could recommend to the City Council. For example, the Board could specifically ask that funding for the UFMP become a priority. He suggested they could discuss the options in more detail when Mr. Lien returns with the collective comments submitted to date by the Board Members. He noted that the draft Tree Code indicates that the UFMP should be completed by the end of 2017; it doesn't say the City must wait until the end of 2017. The goal is to provide flexibility to accommodate funding opportunities, but the UFMP must be completed by a specific date.

Mr. Chave reminded the Board that the City Council is supposed to take action on the Comprehensive Plan in June of 2015. If the Board is far enough along in its review of the draft Tree Code to agree that the priority belongs with the UFMP, they could make that suggestion as part of their recommendation to the City Council relative to the Comprehensive Plan update.

Board Member Stewart referred to the most recent draft of the Street Tree Plan and noted that the comments she submitted to staff in writing since the last meeting have not been incorporated. Mr. Chave clarified that no changes were made to the Street Tree Plan since it was last reviewed by the Board. Staff is waiting for feedback from the Tree Board, as well as written feedback from Board Members before updating the document for the Board's continued review.

2015 TRANSPORTATION PLAN (DRAFT PROJECT LIST/LEVEL OF SERVICE)

Mr. Hauss reviewed that the City has been working with consultants from Fehr and Peers since last October to update the City's Transportation Plan. He reminded the Board that the draft goals and policies for the Transportation Plan were presented on February 11th, and tonight's discussion will focus on the first draft of the project list to be included in the 2015 Transportation Element update, as well as the draft Level of Service (LOS) Standards to be considered for each travel mode. He noted that the Transportation Committee, Walkway Committee and Edmonds Bicycle Club have reviewed the draft project list, as well. He advised that the draft project list and LOS Standards would be presented to the City Council in a few weeks.

Chair Tibbott commented that it would be helpful to understand the difference between LOS A and LOS D. If it is essentially based on the amount of time spent at an intersection, then perhaps it would be helpful to provide some quantitative information. Mr. Hauss replied that a description of the LOS ratings and how they were applied throughout the City would be provided as a figure in the Transportation Plan.

Board Member Rubenkong recalled that the Board previously reviewed the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), which ranks projects based on roadway conditions and the functionality of the roadway rather than LOS. Board Member Cloutier pointed out that many of the roadway projects identified in the CIP are intended to address LOS issues, such as the Five Corners Roundabout.

Mr. Samdahl emphasized that the Growth Management Act (GMA) requires cities to set LOS standards for arterials and transit routes. The regional planning process also anticipates that cities will set similar LOS standards for bicycles and pedestrians. He explained that LOS is basically a measure of a facility's quality of service. In the case of roadways, the scale uses A through F. An LOS A means that the average delay when approaching an intersection is virtually zero, and an LOS D means that an intersection is not quite failing, but the average delay is about 50 seconds. LOS F indicates extreme congestion with delays in excess of one and even two minutes. He advised that, consistent with the City's current LOS standards, the draft Transportation Plan identifies a standard of LOS D or better for arterials and LOS C or better for collector streets.

Mr. Samdahl pointed out that standards for State Routes are different; and currently, the State has identified a standard of LOS E or better for SR-524 and Highway 99 north of SR-104. SR-104 and Highway 99 south of SR-104 have been designated as Highways of Statewide Significance, meaning that they are controlled by the state and connect major destinations. No City standard is defined for these roadways, which are not subject to concurrency. However, to monitor operations on Highways of Statewide Significance, the plan identifies existing and potential future deficiencies, as well as improvements that might be needed, if the State's standard is exceeded.

Mr. Samdahl explained that the proposed roadway projects were analyzed based on LOS and/or safety. He referred to Figure 1, which shows the existing LOS at intersections within the City. He summarized that all intersections currently meet the City's adopted LOS standard; and with the exception of the intersection at 238th Street Southwest and SR-104, all intersections on Highways of Statewide Significance met the State's LOS standard. Mr. Samdahl also referred to Figure 2, which illustrates the anticipated 2035 LOS conditions, both with and without improvements, based on growth forecasts for the City and the region over the next 20 years. He summarized that, without improvements, several intersections are anticipated to exceed the City's LOS Standard. For those intersections that would not meet the City's LOS standard, projects were identified to improve the conditions (Table 2). With the exception of the intersection at Highway 99 and 212th Street Southwest, the proposed improvements would get all intersections operating satisfactorily within the standard. While improvements have been proposed for the intersection of Highway 99 and 212th Street Southwest to make the situation better, widening the highway to provide additional lanes would be needed to fully address the issue. In discussions with both the

Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) and the Transportation Committee, it was agreed that the State would not likely support this drastic approach, and it is not likely the City would be able to fund the project.

Mr. Samdahl provided a map (Figure 3) to illustrate the location of the proposed projects. He briefly referred to the list of projects (Table 2), noting that some involve adding a traffic signals where none currently exist. Where there are already traffic signals in place, options include adding a turn lane or extending the length of the existing turn lane. With the exception of 238th Street Southwest between Edmonds Way and 84th Avenue (Project A), no major road widening projects have been proposed. He explained that Project A is intended to address safety issues as well as LOS problems. As proposed, the roadway would be widened to three lanes with an improved turn lane, safer pedestrian facilities, and bike lanes.

Ms. Samdahl summarized that, for the most part, the projects identified in Table 2 are the same as the projects identified in the current Transportation Element. While some of the projects identified in the current plan have been completed, they have confirmed that the remaining projects are still needed. A few new projects were added, but there are not any surprises to what is currently in the plan.

Chair Tibbott asked if the projects outlined in Table 2 have been prioritized. Mr. Samdahl answered that, although the projects have been assigned a number, the numbers do not indicate any particular priority at this time. Cost estimates for each project, as well as a recommended prioritization, will be presented to the Planning Board at a later time as part of the overall Transportation Element.

Board Member Cloutier announced that, last fall, WSDOT changed the way it does traffic predictions and significantly downgraded their future predictions because the traffic was not rising as predicted. Even though density has gone up, traffic has been flat because of improved transit options. He asked if the City's model indicates a similar trend. Mr. Samdahl explained that the City's model includes growth expectations from throughout the region, based on the regional model. The counts that were collected in 2014 indicate that volumes have not significantly changed, and in some cases, have gone down. They are also finding that the forecast out to 2035 is basically the same as the 2025 forecast. Even with anticipated growth, traffic volumes are not expected to increase substantially except in some areas along Highway 99.

Board Member Cloutier noted that most of the projects identified in Table 2 involve additional lanes and/or signaling. He asked if the City has considered roundabouts as an alternative approach to prevent people from having to stop at each intersection. Mr. Samdahl agreed that roundabouts are a viable option to consider at the design phase. For example, a roundabout may be a desirable approach at the intersection of 9th Avenue South and Main Street. He suggested that language be added to the plan to make it clear that there is flexibility to consider alternatives to additional lanes and/or signaling.

Board Member Robles said he is a member of a small Facebook chat group for the Meadowdale area, and there has been a lot of chatter about safety issues relative to Meadowdale Beach Road. However, the proposed plan rates it as a second priority roadway. He explained that many people walk on this street, but there is only a 6 to 8-inch shoulder. The roadway is close to schools and actually connects the community of Overlake to 76th Avenue West. He summarized that the street has a lot of components that would lend to a higher rating. Mr. Samdahl noted that walkway projects would be discussed later in the presentation.

Board Member Rubenkönig asked if the proposed project list takes into account project planning that is taking place in Lynnwood and Mountlake Terrace. Mr. Samdahl answered affirmatively. Board Member Rubenkönig said she understands that the City of Lynnwood is proposing a new roadway at 206th to connect Highway 99 to Edmonds Community College. They have also proposed a roundabout at 64th Avenue West. She asked if this project would impact how the City chooses to approach the intersections at Highway 99 and 208th and 212th Streets Southwest. Mr. Samdahl responded that this specific project was not included in the City's traffic model, but he agreed to review the project and consider any impacts it might have on City of Edmonds intersections.

Chair Tibbott referred to Project A on Table 2 and said his understanding is that 84th Avenue West is intended to become a new north/south corridor. He asked if widening the roadway would help improve safety along the corridor. He also asked to what extent the improvements on 84th Avenue West would impact the interchange that is planned for the intersection of 228th Street Southwest and Highway 99 (Project 14). Mr. Samdahl said the assumption is that the City could move forward with the anticipated growth on 84th Avenue West after the widening has been completed on 228th Street Southwest. Mr. Hauss

added that improvements on 84th Avenue West (Project A) are intended to address safety issues. The project would create a new left turn lane to improve access into and from driveways. Although the changes proposed at the intersection of 228th Street Southwest and Highway 99 will generate more traffic (from 3,000 vehicles per day to 5,000 to 6,000 vehicles per day), the project on 84th Avenue West is not intended to create a significant amount of additional traffic. He reminded the Board that the 84th Avenue West project (Project A) will include new sidewalks and bicycle lanes to improve safety on the street.

Chair Tibbott asked if the new interchange and additional traffic anticipated on 220th Street could end up increasing the priority for the 84th Street project. Mr. Hauss agreed that is possible. He noted that the current Transportation Plan estimates the project would cost about \$20 million, which could be split 50/50 since a portion of the street is located within Snohomish County's jurisdiction (Esperance). While the project is important, it may take some time to obtain grant funding.

Mr. Hauss reported that the Walkway Committee reviewed the current Transportation Plan to identify the projects that have been completed, as well as new projects that need to be added. They also developed criteria to evaluate and prioritize walkway improvement projects based on pedestrian safety, connectivity, activity, distance from schools, connectivity to transit routes and facilities and environmental impacts. He referred to Figure 4, which is a map of the existing and recommended walkways, and noted that the projects are spread throughout the entire City. He explained that walkway sections longer than 1,000 feet are defined as "long walkways" and walkway sections shorter than 1,000 feet are defined as "short walkways." He referred to Table 3, which summarizes the proposed walkway improvements by the type of project (long or short) and ranks the projects by total points and priority level. Mr. Samdahl pointed out that three new walkway projects were added to the list based on feedback from the public at the open house.

Board Member Robles noted that walkway improvements on Meadowdale Beach Road were ranked quite low (#23) on the list of projects (Table 3). He pointed out that the roadway is poor, traffic travels at high speeds, and there is poor lighting. Mr. Hauss commented that the walkway improvements on Meadowdale Beach Road will be costly because some type of wall and railing will be required. He explained that, although the project is ranked lower on the list, the City will still seek grant opportunities to move the project forward.

Mr. Samdahl explained that the City has developed an LOS standard for walkways (Table 4), which uses a simple red, yellow and green scale to identify whether a pedestrian facility improvement is consistent with the proposed walkway plan. He suggested the City could use this standard to monitor how well the Walkway Plan is being implemented over time. As per Table 4, a walkway would meet the "green" standard if it is consistent with what is identified in the Walkway Plan. A "yellow" standard would apply to walkways that provide a lower-pedestrian facility than recommended in the Walkway Plan. Designated walkways where no pedestrian facilities are present would receive a "red" rating.

Chair Tibbott asked if staff could provide examples of what the City might do in a situation where a pedestrian facility is required but is currently LOS red. How would the City take steps to bring the LOS to at least yellow? Mr. Hauss said they are still working out the details, and they do not have any examples to share at this time. Chair Tibbott observed that residents of his neighborhood have created a pathway through the woods to connect to Southwest County Park and there is a dangerous corner that pedestrians from his neighborhood must use to access the sidewalk on Olympic View Drive. This is an example of where the City could provide something better than a trail through the woods to improve safety in areas where there are currently no sidewalks and no sidewalk projects have been proposed. Mr. Hauss responded that sidewalks are the safest approach, but they could also consider less costly alternatives such as wider shoulders. However, it is important to keep in mind that all of the sidewalk improvements made during the last eight years have been funded by grants, and grants are not typically available for shoulder projects. At this time, the City does not have funding to implement the alternative approaches, either.

Chair Tibbott noted that the walkway projects identified on 176th Street Southwest (L24) and 174th Street Southwest (L23) are both long walkways that are intended to address issues that have been present for decades. There are beautiful new sidewalks on Olympic View Drive that are used by students from Meadowdale Junior High School. If they take a right on 176th Street, the sidewalk ends in a blackberry bramble and there is a sight distance problem. He suggested there must be a solution the City could consider to alleviate the difficulty of being a pedestrian in places like this around the City.

Board Member Stewart asked if staff has ever reached out to the community to find more pedestrian easement opportunities. She noted that in some locations, private property owners have granted easements or vacated right-of-way space to

accommodate pathways to connect streets where no sidewalks are present. She particularly noted that Port Townsend actually provides a map of their pedestrian easements. Mr. Hauss agreed to research this option further, and Mr. Samdahl suggested these opportunities could be identified on the map as potential actions the City could pursue. Chair Tibbott suggested this could be an interesting option to address current problems on 176th Street Southwest. Removing vegetation along the street to create a wider shoulder area could improve pedestrian safety.

Mr. Hauss announced that the Bicycle Plan that was adopted in 2009 has been revised to outline a list of improvement projects for bicycle safety. He provided a map (Figure 5) that identifies the location of all the recommended bicycle facilities, which include share-use paths and trails, bike lanes, bike routes, bike sharrows and bike parking. He noted the longer north/south and east/west bicycle lane projects that have been identified in the plan, particularly emphasizing the proposed bicycle lane on 100th Avenue West and 9th Avenue South. He reminded the Board that the bicycle lanes included as part of the 220th Street Southwest roadway improvement project (from 9th Avenue South to 84th Street Southwest) should be finished in just a few months. Roadway improvements on 228th Street will also include bicycle lanes, and the City of Mountlake Terrace is planning to add bike lanes to connect to the transit station at 236th Street Southwest.

Mr. Hauss reported that the Cities of Edmonds, Mountlake Terrace and Lynnwood have received a \$1.4 million grant for bicycle improvements over the next two years, and design work will start in the next few months. It is anticipated that implementation will begin in 2016. One project will include the “road diet” concept where the current four-lanes on 76th Avenue West will be converted to three vehicular lanes with bicycle lanes on both sides of the street to provide a north/south route. In addition to the bicycle lanes identified on the map, bike sharrows have been and will continue to be used. Sharrows are marks within the travel lane that alert motorists that the roadway is designated as a bicycle route.

Board Member Robles suggested that when presenting the transportation plan, it would be helpful to include a legal definition of a non-motorized vehicle to make it clear that it includes vehicles powered by small motors traveling less than 35 miles per hour, as per the Washington State Motor Vehicle Law.

Chair Tibbott noted that bike sharrows are proposed on Olympic View Drive. Mr. Hauss explained that adding bicycle lanes to this roadway would be costly because additional pavement would be required. He clarified that all the proposed new bicycle lanes will be constructed within the existing roadway configurations, and no road widening will be required. Chair Tibbott said he understands the difficulties associated with adding new bike lanes and that bike sharrows are a less costly alternative. However, he questioned if the safety benefits provided by the sharrows, particularly on Olympic View Drive, will justify the cost of installation and maintenance. Mr. Hauss explained that some streets traditionally get a lot of bicycle activity. Where bicycle lanes are not feasible, sharrows will be added to make people aware that the street is a popular bicycle route. He emphasized that the cost of installing sharrows is small, and the product lasts for upwards of 10 years.

Board Member Rubenkonig thanked Mr. Samdahl and Mr. Hauss for the wonderful visual presentations they provided. She said she appreciated the clarification that most of the projects in the proposed Transportation Plan are also in the current Transportation Plan. She was glad to hear that the plan has been reviewed by other community groups (Edmonds Bicycle Club, Walkway Committee, and Transportation Committee), and she appreciated staff’s ability to work with citizens to prioritize the projects.

Mr. Samdahl emphasized that the Growth Management Act (GMA) specifically requires cities to include LOS standards relative to transit and consider what can be done to facilitate transit. He reviewed that Community Transit is the major provider of public transportation in Snohomish County. He provided a map of the existing transit service (Figure 6) and explained that fixed route transit is considered to be ideal when transit stops are located within a quarter mile of residents. He referred to Figure 6, which shows the proportion of Edmonds within a quarter mile of a fixed route local or commuter transit service and summarized that approximately 60% of the population lives within a quarter mile of local bus service and approximately 74% lives within a quarter mile of either local or commuter service. However, transit coverage was reduced when Community Transit eliminated some bus routes after 2010, resulting in inadequate coverage in some areas of the City. The goal is to work with Community Transit to restore service to these areas as funding becomes available.

Next, Mr. Samdahl referred to Figure 7, which depicts the future transit system. He specifically pointed out the potential priority transit corridors, which would emphasize good daily transit service and bus stop amenities to make transit attractive. He summarized that, with the expected opening of Link Light Rail to Lynnwood during the planning horizon, it is likely that

several Community Transit bus routes would be redesigned within Edmonds and surrounding areas to integrate the light rail. Including this information in the plan will allow the City to work closely with Sound Transit and Community Transit as plans are put together.

Mr. Samdahl referred to Table 7, which outlines the proposed transit LOS policy, which uses a green, yellow and red approach. He explained that LOS along the priority corridors would be measured based on transit stop amenities, pedestrian access to stops, and quality of service. He acknowledged that quality of service is outside of the City's control, but the LOS policy would guide the City's discussions with Community Transit and other transit providers. He emphasized that a green LOS would be a desired standard to strive for as the plan is implemented, and this would require that more than 80% of the transit stops meet amenity minimum provisions, that sidewalks and crosswalks serving the stops are marked, and that there is all day, frequent service and adequate parking.

Chair Tibbott suggested it would also be helpful to include the light rail corridor in the plan. Mr. Samdahl pointed out that the light rail line and stations are identified on Figure 7. He explained that there are currently two proposed stops, one at 216th Street Southwest and another at 200th Street Southwest. A provisional stop has also been identified at 220th Street Southwest, with the understanding that funding for this station is not currently in the plan. It was included in the design so it could be added subsequently if funding becomes available. He suggested that including the 220th Street Southwest station on the map can help the City advocate for the additional stop in the future.

Chair Tibbott asked if parking would be provided at each of the stations. Mr. Hauss was unable to answer that question, but he agreed to research Sound Transit's future plans and provide appropriate information in the plan.

Mr. Hauss explained that he and Mr. Samdahl would provide a similar presentation to the City Council on April 21st. They plan to come back to the Board on May 13th with a draft Transportation Plan for their consideration. He invited the Board Members to submit additional questions related to the plan via email.

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

Chair Tibbott announced that representatives from Verdant Health Care and Edmonds Swedish Hospital have agreed to attend the Planning Board's retreat to share information about the medical district, as well as future plans. The retreat is scheduled for June 24th and will be held in a board room on the Edmonds Swedish Hospital Campus. He invited Board Members to share their ideas for additional discussion topics.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

Chair Tibbott advised that, since the last meeting, he has had an opportunity to review the draft Tree Code in greater detail and consider the comments made by the Planning Board and citizens of the community. When the Tree Code comes back to the Board for further discussion, he requested that staff provide sample tree codes from other jurisdictions to help the Board better understand the proposal. He commented that the proposed Tree Code represents a drastic change in the way the City has administered tree regulations up to this point, and it will be very important to get the word out for the public hearing. He encouraged City staff and Planning Board Members to make every effort to invite public involvement in the process.

Chair Tibbott also asked staff to provide a cost estimate for what it would take to administer the proposed Tree Code. He recalled that staff previously mentioned an additional full-time staff person would likely be needed. If that is the case, the City must consider what possible revenue might be generated by the Tree Code and whether this revenue would cover the full cost of City personnel. Mr. Chave said that the Development Services Director now believes that at least two additional staff would be needed to administer the Tree Code as currently drafted. Again, Chair Tibbott asked staff to provide its best estimate before the Tree Code is presented at a public hearing.

Chair Tibbott requested that staff compile a list of the questions and comments submitted by the Planning Board to staff via email. Mr. Chave agreed to provide a list of all the questions to date. Chair Tibbott encouraged the Board Members to continue to submit their questions and comments to staff.

APPROVED

Board Member Robles questioned if it would be easier to save the effort of public discourse and the problems the current draft Tree Code could present by differing further consideration until after an Urban Forest Management Plan (UFMP) has been adopted. He said it appears that will likely be the Board's recommendation, and it does not seem necessary to go through a lengthy public process if they decide to put the Tree Code on hold. Chair Tibbott agreed that is one possible action the Board could take relative to the Tree Code. However, he felt it would be helpful and appropriate to hear from the public and review the comments and questions submitted by Board Members prior to making this determination.

Board Member Rubenkonig asked if, at one time, the City had a tree protection ordinance for the downtown area that was more restrictive than the rest of Edmonds. Mr. Chave answered that the concept was discussed at one point, and the City Council placed a moratorium on tree cutting in the rights-of-way for a period of time. However, there was no specific tree protection ordinance specific to the downtown. Board Member Robles pointed out that other cities have tree protection ordinances that are specific to certain areas. Mr. Chave agreed and said this concept could be addressed as part of an Urban Forest Management Plan.

Board Member Rubenkonig asked if the impetus for moving the Tree Code forward now is that more tree cutting is taking place in downtown Edmonds. Board Member Stewart suggested that there is concern that too many trees are being removed from all areas of the City, and the issue is more related to the loss of tree canopy than to view. Board Member Robles observed that until an Urban Forest Management Plan is in place, the City will not have any quantitative information by which to gauge the Tree Code's effectiveness.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Board Member Cloutier announced that the City Council adopted the Planning Board's recommendation relative to the Westgate Plan on April 7th with only minor amendments that he found acceptable.

Board Member Stewart announced that Bill Phillips would present a walking tour of the City's shoreline parks on Saturday, April 25th, from 9 a.m. to 11 a.m. Mr. Phillips is an older gentleman who served on the Planning Board for 19 years, during which time many park lands were acquired by the City. The tour will start at Brackett's Landing. She invited interested Board Members to attend the event and noted that Mr. Phillips would present a walking tour of upland parks at a later date. If weather permits, My Edmonds News is planning to video the tour and make it available on their site.

Board Member Robles complimented Chair Tibbott for his excellent direction over the past several months as he helped the Board navigate through difficult discussions.

ADJOURNMENT

The Board meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

APPROVED