

APPROVED NOVEMBER 18TH

**CITY OF EDMONDS
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

October 28, 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
Matthew Cheung
Todd Cloutier
Daniel Robles
Valerie Stewart
Nathan Monroe
Samuel Kleven (Student Representative)

STAFF PRESENT

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager
Mike Thies, Code Enforcement Officer
Jim Lawless, Assistant Police Chief
Jeff Taraday, City Attorney
Karin Noyes, Recorder

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT

Carreen Rubenkönig (excused)

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

VICE CHAIR LOVELL MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 14, 2015 BE APPROVED AS AMENDED. BOARD MEMBER STEWART SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

The agenda was modified to place Item 8a (Proposed Code Amendment Related to Vehicles on Single-Family Residential Lots) before Item 7a (Development Code Update Status Report). The remainder of the agenda was accepted as presented.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS

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

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIRECTOR REPORT TO PLANNING BOARD

Vice Chair Lovell referred to Snohomish County's proposed zoning amendments that could affect unincorporated urban growth areas, including Esperance. His understanding is that there are certain building, zoning and land-use regulations that exist in Esperance that are inconsistent with the City's current code. He asked if the City has a methodology in place to address these inconsistencies and to equalize the infrastructure in advance of Esperance being incorporated into the City. Mr. Chave answered that the County currently controls the capital improvements that occur in Esperance. Although the City pays attention and can provide input, the County also sets the zoning regulations for this area, and they are not always consistent with the City's regulations. If the area is annexed at some point in the future, the City would attempt to apply its closest equivalent zoning, but it will not always be an exact fit. While the density is usually comparable, details related to setbacks, height, etc. can create problems. The City is currently reviewing the County's proposal and will comment as appropriate.

TRAINING ON APPEARANCE OF FAIRNESS AND OTHER INFORMATION

Mr. Taraday, City Attorney, provided training specific to the Appearance of Fairness Doctrine, which is codified in Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 42.36 and applies to all quasi-judicial actions. The name implies that quasi-judicial hearings involving local land-use matters must not only be fair in fact; they must also appear to be fair. He explained that when acting in a quasi-judicial capacity, Board Members act as judges rather than policy makers. The quasi-judicial process applies to those actions of a legislative body, planning commission, hearing examiner or boards which determine the legal rights, duties or privileges of specific parties in a hearing or other contested case proceeding. It does not apply to legislative actions adopting, amending, or revising comprehensive, community or neighborhood plans or other land use planning documents or the adoption of area-wide zoning ordinances or the adoption of a zoning amendment that is of area-wide significance. He emphasized that the Appearance of Fairness Doctrine cannot apply in the absence of a hearing.

Mr. Taraday reviewed the types of actions that are considered quasi-judicial, as well as those that are not. He advised that the only quasi-judicial actions that come before the Planning Board are site-specific rezones. All other items that come before the Planning Board are legislative, and the Appearance of Fairness Doctrine would not be applicable. He advised as per RCW 42.36.060, the general rule is that "During the pendency of any quasi-judicial proceeding, no member of a decision-making body may engage in ex parte communications with opponents or proponents with respect to the proposal which is the subject of the proceeding." A typical question is when decision-making bodies must start avoiding the communications, and the rule is that as soon as an application is filed, it becomes a quasi-judicial proceeding. While it would not technically be considered a violation of law for a Board Member to speak to someone about a potential site-specific rezone if an application has not yet been submitted, he cautioned against them engaging in these discussions because an application may come before them in the future.

Mr. Taraday commented that sometimes ex parte communications occur unintentionally. For example, a Board Member may receive an email that is opened and read without realizing that the subject matter is quasi-judicial. If this occurs, the Board Member is responsible to take action to cure the ex parte communication by:

1. **Placing on the record the substance of any written or oral ex parte communication concerning the decision of action.** In the case of an email, the Board Member could forward the email to the planner who is working on the matter, asking that it be placed in the Board's packet. The document would then be in the record, and the full substance of the communication would be available to all. If someone approaches a Board Member about a site-specific rezone, they most likely have an opinion or they wouldn't be talking about it. Even if it is not clear whether that person is a proponent or opponent, it is best to avoid the communication.
2. **A public announcement of the content of the communication and of the parties' rights to rebut the substance of the communication shall be made at each hearing where action is considered or taken on the subject to which the communication related.** In the case of an email, the Board Member should disclose that an email was received and included in the packet. The chair has the responsibility to ensure that the other party has an opportunity to rebut the substance of the communication during the hearing.

Mr. Taraday advised that the ex parte communication rule does not preclude:

1. **Seeking in a public hearing specific information or data from such parties relative to the decision if both the request and the results are a part of the record.** The Board is responsible for conducting the open record for site-specific rezones and can ask any question they want. Because the City Council must rely on the record that is established at the Planning Board's hearing, it is incumbent upon the Board to be as thorough as possible in its questions and fact finding so the City Council can see all of the factual development in the Board's minutes and the documents they requested.
2. **Correspondence between a citizen and his or her elected official if any such correspondence is made a part of the record when it pertains to the subject matter of a quasi-judicial proceeding.** There is concern about relying too heavily on this language because it can be interpreted as opening the door for elected officials to have any communication they want, as long as it is made part of the record. If applied to the City Council, there would be

APPROVED

almost no ban on ex parte communications, which would make it very difficult for City Council Members to retain their quasi-judicial impartiality that is so important to the process. He does not believe that is the intent of the law.

Mr. Taraday said that, in addition to ex parte communications, the other aspect of the Appearance of Fairness Doctrine the Board needs to be mindful of is bias. A decision maker may be challenged for prejudgment concerning issues of fact about parties or partiality evidencing a personal bias or personal prejudice. He cautioned if a Board Member is having regular correspondence with a citizen relative to a site specific rezone that will come before the Board as a quasi-judicial hearing, it will be difficult to defend a charge that he/she is engaging in partiality and/or evidencing a personal bias. He discouraged the Board Members from participating in this type of correspondence.

Mr. Taraday said the RCW states that participation by a member of a decision-making body in earlier proceedings that result in an advisory recommendation to a decision-making body shall not disqualify that person from participating in any subsequent quasi-judicial proceeding. For example, if someone were to recommend a site-specific rezone in their capacity as a Planning Board Member and then later be appointed or elected to the City Council, he/she would not be precluded from being a decision maker when the item comes before the City Council.

Mr. Taraday explained that anyone seeking to disqualify a member of a decision-making body must raise the challenge as soon as the basis for the disqualification is made known to the individual, and it is the chair's responsibility to ferret out any possible objectives pertaining to the Appearance of Fairness Rules at the earliest opportunity. Using the script provided by the City Attorney forces Board Members to disclose ex parte communications and invites members of the audience to raise their concerns. If no challenges are issued at that time, the matter is considered concluded. The script is a great risk management tool for the City.

Mr. Taraday emphasized that challengers cannot use the Appearance of Fairness Doctrine to destroy a quorum. The Planning Board must be able to do its work. If a number of Board Members are challenged and there is no longer a quorum available to hear the proposal and make a recommendation, all of the challenged Board Members would get to participate as if they had not been challenged.

Mr. Taraday pointed out that, notwithstanding the law, there are other reasons to avoid ex parte communications. They are simply not fair, as the Board is supposed to act as judges and hear from both parties. Ex parte communications can also lead to wrong findings. If a Board Member hears privately from someone about a particular issue of fact that relates to a site-specific rezone and does not share the information as part of the record, it will be difficult to know the whole story. Ex parte communication should be made public so the other party is allowed to rebut the circumstances before the Board decides whether the ex parte communication is true or false. He cautioned that it will be very difficult for him to defend a decision if it was made based upon facts that were privately communicated and not part of the record.

He summarized that when ex parte communication situations come up, Board Members should cut them off, disclose what was said at the earliest opportunity, put the substance of the communication on the record, and provide an opportunity for rebuttal. If challenged, Board Members should ask themselves, "Would a disinterested person, with knowledge of the totality of my personal interest or involvement, be reasonably justified in thinking that my involvement might affect my judgment?" If the answer to that question is yes, then the Board Member should not participate.

Again, Mr. Taraday reemphasized that the Board has a big responsibility in making the open record. It is important that those who participate in the hearing speak at the microphone so comments can become part of the recording and/or transcript. They should also make sure that all exhibits brought forward during the hearing are labeled and made part of the record. With only a few exceptions, only one open-record hearing is allowed. It is important for the Board Members to ask all of the pertinent questions and get them resolved. They should not be afraid to challenge people who speak during the hearing, and it is not inappropriate for them to cross examine a witness. Witnesses are testifying under oath, and it is not inappropriate to ask them questions or press them on a point in order for the Board to have a full and complete understanding of the facts.

Mr. Taraday reminded the Board that it is not just enough for them to recommend approval or denial of a proposal. The recommendation must be supported with findings of fact. The Staff Report will provide proposed findings of fact. If the Board agrees with the findings of fact in the Staff Report, it should be noted as part of the motion. The Board could also choose to amend or even reject the findings of fact provided in the Staff Report. However, the reasons must be clearly stated

as part of the motion so that the decision maker (City Council) has a clear understanding of the recommendation. The Board should not hesitate to take its time when reviewing proposals and making recommendations to the City Council. A decision is not required immediately following the hearing. If follow up is required, the Board should not feel pressured to make a hasty decision before knowing all of the pertinent facts. The Board should not commit its recommendation to writing if it cannot get the language right. The staff and/or City Attorney can assist the Board in amending or drafting new findings to support the recommendation.

Vice Chair Lovell recalled that several years ago, the Planning Board conducted a series of meetings and public hearings relative to the Port of Edmonds Harbor Square Master Plan. He asked if this process was considered quasi-judicial. Mr. Taraday answered that the Port of Edmonds was asking that the City to amend its Comprehensive Plan to incorporate their master plan. Comprehensive Plan amendments are legislative rather than quasi-judicial decisions. With legislative decisions, the Planning Board can take as much time as they need and have more than one public hearing.

Mr. Taraday said sometimes an applicant will submit applications for a Comprehensive Plan amendment and a site-specific rezone concurrently. He always recommends that the applications be considered in two separate procedures, with the Comprehensive Plan amendment being decided first. If the Comprehensive Plan amendment is adopted, the site-specific rezone application could begin its way through the process.

Chair Tibbott asked for suggestions on how the City could facilitate communication so the Board has ample warning that a site-specific rezone will be coming before them. Mr. Taraday suggested that perhaps a mechanism could be built into the process so that when an application for a site-specific rezone is filed, a notice is automatically sent to Planning Board and City Council Members. Vice Chair Lovell pointed out that the Board typically receives notice, via the extended agenda, when a quasi-judicial action is scheduled to come before them. Mr. Chave agreed that site-specific rezones are typically placed on the Board's extended agenda as placeholders as soon as applications are received. The agenda item usually includes the address of the subject property and a brief description of the proposed change.

Mr. Taraday discouraged Board Members from visiting sites that are the subject of a site-specific rezone application prior to the public hearing. It is possible that Board Members will see something on the site visit that is not part of the record. He cannot incorporate site visits into the record and use them to defend the Board's decision. If Board Members feel there is insufficient information to make an informed decision, they can request additional photographs. However, their decision should be based on photographs and not site visits. Photos can be replicated and put before a judge, enabling everyone to look at the same evidence.

PROPOSED CODE AMENDMENTS RELATED TO VEHICLES ON SINGLE-FAMILY LOTS

Mr. Thies advised that concerns are periodically raised about perceived large numbers of vehicles parked on various single-family residential lots and about extensive vehicle repair being done in front yards. He and the Development Services Director have been working with officers in the Police Department to craft draft zoning amendments to address the issues that have been raised. As proposed, the amendments would address how many vehicles would be allowed in front of a home and where they could be located.

Vice Chair Lovell reminded the Board that the City handles code violations on a complaint basis when someone notifies the Code Enforcement Officer of a code violation. It is his understanding that most of the complaints are related to neighborhood conflicts. When a complaint is filed, the Code Enforcement Officer investigates and tries to settle the issue. He referred to a property he drives by frequently where the owner is clearly operating an automobile repair business on a single-family residential lot. There are typically six to ten cars located in front of the home, and he is surprised that no one has filed a complaint. Mr. Thies agreed that many of the complaints originate from neighborhood conflicts, but most do not. A code violation only becomes a City problem if someone complains; the City does not drive around looking for problems.

Vice Chair Lovell asked Mr. Thies to share the reasons for the proposed amendments. Mr. Thies said the amendments are intended to address problems that have come up over the years; some that were easy to resolve and others that were more difficult. The proposed amendments are intended to tighten the regulations by limiting the number of vehicles that can park in front of a home. Vice Chair Lovell asked how the stricter regulations would be enforced, and Mr. Thies acknowledged that enforcement would continue to occur on a complaint basis. If a complaint is filed, he would visit the site to investigate

the problem. If there is a code violation, he notifies the property owner of the rules and what needs to be done to bring the property into compliance. If the property owner does not cooperate, the City can establish time limits and assess fines to force compliance.

Vice Chair Lovell pointed out that, as currently proposed, the language would not only address situations where there is evidence that someone is operating a car repair business from a residential property, it would also apply to people who hoard and/or collect cars. Mr. Thies agreed that the provision would apply to all situations where too many cars are parked in front of a single-family home. He explained that it is easier for the City to enforce situations where someone is operating a repair business from a single-family home, but it is more difficult to address situations where people collect or hoard large numbers of cars. He summarized that the proposed amendments are intended to tighten up the code, but he acknowledged they will not solve every problem.

Assistant Police Chief Lawless said he and the Development Services Director have been working together to tackle a number of issues, and the proposed amendment is just one prong of what they are hoping will be a broader set of tools. The proposed amendment is the result of several meetings between the Development Services Director, Code Enforcement Officer, representatives from the Parking Enforcement Unit and a representative from the City Attorney's office. The intent is to shore up the code language that relates to parking so that the Police Department and Code Enforcement Officer can better address the concerns that come up. The goal is to be respectful and understanding of individual situations, while addressing the long-term issues that have to do with people taking it to the extreme. The proposed language would limit the number of cars that are in the public's view to protect the neighbors' quality of life without overly infringing upon an individual's right to have personal property. The proposed amendment would prohibit the parking of more than four vehicles in the front yards of single-family lots but would specify that the restriction applies only outdoors.

Assistant Police Chief Lawless said he anticipates that concerns will come up at the hearing about what the City intends to do if the proposed amendment pushes cars somewhere else. This issue has come up before because cars have been pushed out to the street. He is working with the City Attorney to create code language relative to on-street parking that addresses the number of vehicles a person or household can have parked on a street within a certain distance from the street. However, this amendment applies to the Edmonds City Code and does not require Planning Board review.

Board Member Stewart referred to Section 17.60.040(D)(1) and said she supports the proposed requirement that that vehicles in the front yard must be parked on a driveway or other improved parking surface. She also supports limiting the amount of improved surface in the front yard. However, she suggested that the definition for "improved surface" (Section 17.60.005) should be amended to read, "*The outdoor area covered by a permanent hard pervious or impervious surface, including concrete, asphalt, or pavers such as pervious pavers or grasscrete.*" She felt it is important for people to understand that there are options other than hard surfaces, and pervious pavers and grasscrete could actually infiltrate some of the stuff coming off of cars into the soils below. She pointed out that pervious pavers and grasscrete serve frequently in green building projects now, and are often used in new projects for parking. Chair Lovell concurred with the thought, but noted that, along with water, there would also be oil and gasoline going into the soil. Board Member Stewart suggested that infiltration would be better than the materials going into the storm drains.

Board Member Monroe asked staff to clarify the purpose of limiting the amount of impervious surface and the width of driveways as proposed in Section 17.60.040(D)(1). Mr. Thies said the intent is to limit how much of the front yard can be taken up by vehicles. Board Member Monroe asked if the provisions would prohibit him from paving his front yard for a patio. Mr. Chave referred to the definition for "improved surface" which specifically targets driving or parking motor vehicles on hard surfaces and is not intended to preclude other uses such as patios. Patios that cover more than 50% of the front yard area would be allowed as long as it is clearly separated from the driving surface and there is no way for cars to park on it. However, he agreed to double check to clarify the intent of the proposed provision.

Vice Chair Lovell summarized that the proposed amendment is intended to prevent people from parking in front yards unless a suitable surface is provided. Mr. Thies agreed that the proposed language attempts to organize it more so that cars are not stacked up on front yards. Board Member Monroe questioned why the City does not go a step further and require that cars must be parked in driveways that are approved by the City. Mr. Thiess said the intent was to take a smaller step. Vice Chair Lovell noted that some properties do not have garages or carports.

Board Member Robles cautioned against turning the provision into a poor tax. People who make less than adequate income will be most impacted by the provision. Board Member Cheung observed that, in some cases, there may be a reason why a car is not operable, and perhaps the owner is saving money to fix it. Would they be in violation of the code if the vehicle is parked outside their home? Mr. Thies answered that the City's junk vehicle code does not require the vehicles to be operable, just licensed. However, Board Member Cheung pointed out that Section 17.60.040(A) requires that vehicles be both licensed and operable. Mr. Thies suggested that this language may need to be altered to be consistent with the junk vehicle code. As written, the code would require inoperable cars to be stored in the carport, garage or in the backyard behind a screen. Board Member Cheung agreed with Board Member Robles that not everyone has the same level of resources. Those living in apartments may not have their own parking space, and they may have to park on the street. He does not want the City to penalize people who do not have money to fix their cars. As proposed, there would be no exception for people who would prefer to have an operable car, but just can't afford it. Mr. Thies reminded the Board that the provision would only be enforced if someone were to complain.

Board Member Stewart observed that, as currently written, cars cannot be parked on the front lawn because it is technically not suitable for parking. She pointed out that some jurisdictions actually encourage people to wash their cars on the grass because runoff from the car goes into the ground rather than the stormwater. She does not think it is so bad to allow cars to park on grass because it addresses runoff better than being on a hard surface.

Board Member Robles reminded the Board that the City has also made provisions for higher density housing to accommodate low income citizens and address the variability that families have in their living structure. People can rent rooms or develop accessory dwelling units on their properties, which will result in additional residents and their guests. He said he would like to preserve this ability, at least in spirit, when considering new laws. Mr. Thies pointed out that parking is a requirement of any accessory dwelling unit proposal. He acknowledged that these situations could increase the number of cars parked on residential properties, and he agreed to point out this concern to the Development Services Director.

Chair Tibbott asked if the provision would allow for cars to be parked in the front yard if they are screened from the street view by a tall hedge or fence. Mr. Thies answered that, as currently written, cars would not be allowed to park in the front yard even if they are screened. All cars must be parked on an approved surface as defined in the draft language.

Assistant Police Chief Lawless said the purpose of tonight's presentation was to bring the draft ordinance forward for the Board's review and input. Their feedback will be incorporated into an updated draft ordinance that is scheduled for a public hearing on November 18th.

DEVELOPMENT CODE UPDATE STATUS REPORT

Mr. Chave provided a progress report on the Development Code Update. He reminded the Board that the City hired a consultant to assist staff in reviewing the current code language and preparing draft code language to bring before the Board for review and public hearings. In addition, a public open house was held, and a webpage was established to provide pertinent information to the public as the process goes along.

Mr. Chave advised that, thus far, the consultant has found that the City's current code has overlaps, conflicts, confusing organization and unclear language. There is also a lack of completeness for some topics, and imprecision relative to design standards and the design review process. In addition, there are inconsistent, uncertain or incomplete definitions, roles and procedures. This makes it difficult for staff to assist applicants. Even staff, who is very familiar with the code, often has difficulties explaining how it works, as well as the contradictions and inconsistencies. Applicants should have the ability to go on line and figure out the requirements on their own, but that is not possible with the City's current code. A lot of work will be needed to accomplish the update. Because some sections are interwoven with others, many of the changes will also require amendments to other sections of the code.

Mr. Chave reminded the Board that in 2015, the City was required to complete updates to its Comprehensive Plan, Critical Areas Ordinance and Shoreline Master Plan. These projects required a lot of work by the Board, City Council and staff. While the Development Code got off to a slow start, they are now making significant progress. Items they are currently working on include critical areas, subdivisions, planned residential developments, permit processes that are consistent with State law, administrative procedures, definitions that are used consistently throughout the code, signs, design review

standards for multi-family development and a simplified and consistent design review process. In addition, the Engineering Department is working with a consultant to create a new stormwater chapter, which will have implications for other chapters of the code.

Mr. Chave advised that the staff and consultant's intent is to get at least some of the chapters solidified by the end of 2015 so the Board can begin its review and public hearings in early 2016.

Vice Chair Lovell said it appears the code update topics would be presented for public review in three groups. He asked if the public's comments would be limited to the topics contained in the group that is currently before the Board, or if members of the public could speak to the Board regarding any topic related to the Development Code. Mr. Chave agreed that the chapters would be presented to the Board in groups. He said citizens would be encouraged to focus on the chapters that are before the Board for review at the time. However, he recognized that discussion of proposed changes to one chapter may generate comments, concerns and questions about an entirely different chapter. The public comments would not be limited to a specific topic.

Vice Chair Lovell asked how staff plans to solicit public input, and Mr. Chave answered that the proposed changes will be posted on the City's website, along with instructions on how citizens can provide on-line comments. Citizens can also send letters or emails to the City. In addition, the City will conduct at least two more open houses to solicit comments, and the Planning Board will have public hearings, as well. He summarized that the intent is to provide as many avenues for public comment as possible.

Chair Tibbott asked if the City has a code template they can start with. Mr. Chave answered that there is no template. He explained that codes are unique to each jurisdiction because they all have different issues that need to be addressed.

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

Chair Tibbott reminded the Board that their November 11th meeting was rescheduled to November 18th. The agenda for that meeting will include a public hearing on the draft amendments to the parking regulations.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

Chair Tibbott pointed out that the electronic packets that were sent to Board Members did not include a combined packet. Mr. Chave said that was an oversight.

Chair Tibbott asked Board Members to communicate the dates they will be absent from meetings to staff so staff can determine whether or not a quorum will be present.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Vice Chair Lovell reported on his attendance at the October 21st Economic Development Commission (EDC) meeting, at which the three major committees (Tourism, Strategic Action Plan (SAP), and Economic Development) provided progress reports and identified their proposed 2016 agendas. The Strategic Action Plan Committee is working on software that will track progress on various actions items contained in the SAP. They discussed the need for a more active and aggressive process for notifying the public of what is going on with SAP implementation. The Economic Development Committee continues to work towards business improvement and enhancement opportunities within the City. It was announced that the Saturday Market will be expanded to include November 14 and 21 and December 5, 12 and 19th. The events will take place near City Hall from 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. Also at the meeting, there was some discussion about whether or not the City Council would decide to sunset the EDC at the end of 2015 or allow them to continue into 2016. Council Member Petso explained that if the EDC continues into 2016, the City Council has recommended there be a new process for appointing members. Interested persons should contact City Council Members to express their interest that the Commission should continue its work and that they would like to be part of it. The City Council is considering various options with respect to the organization of the EDC, including dividing it into separate committees based on the subcommittees. Most of the 17 members have indicated a desire to continue their work to promote economic development in Edmonds.

APPROVED

Vice Chair Lovell advised that the Board's next meeting (November 18th) conflicts with his previous commitment to attend a public meeting sponsored by the Mayor's Task Force for the At-Grade Rail Crossings Alternatives Analysis. If his presence is needed at the Planning Board meeting to constitute a quorum, he could leave the task force meeting early.

Board Member Robles recalled that, at the Board's last meeting, he incorrectly commented that lower Meadowdale Road had not yet been paved. He said the street has been recently paved, and it looks great.

Board Member Stewart reported on her attendance at the 2015 Green Building Slam at Kane Hall on the University of Washington Campus on October 24th. The event was sponsored by the Northwest EcoBuilding Guild and included a presentation of 10 innovative green projects in the region, most of them in the Seattle area. It also provided an opportunity to network and obtain educational materials. She referred to a flyer that illustrates how behind Snohomish County, and particularly the City of Edmonds, is. She explained that the Green Building Certification Program is regional and based on a prescriptive checklist. It was reported at the meeting that 58% of new homes in Seattle and 34% of new homes in King County were certified Built Green in 2014. She does not have numbers for Snohomish County and Edmonds, but she will attempt to find them and report back. She reminded the Board that the benefits of green building include greater indoor comfort, lower energy bills, less and/or non-toxic materials that result in a better indoor environment, less resource use, and less green house gas emissions. In addition, green building also helps ensure that wildlife habitat will stay healthy.

ADJOURNMENT

The Board meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

APPROVED