

**CITY OF EDMONDS  
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

**July 26, 2017**

---

---

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

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT**

Carreen Rubenkönig, Chair  
Nathan Monroe, Vice Chair  
Phil Lovell  
Daniel Robles  
Todd Cloutier  
Mike Rosen

**STAFF PRESENT**

Shane Hope, Development Services Director  
Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager  
Jerry Bevington, Video Recorder

**BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT**

Matthew Cheung (excused)  
Alicia Crank (excused)

**READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**VICE CHAIR MONROE MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF JULY 12, 2017 BE APPROVED AS CORRECTED. BOARD MEMBER LOVELL SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA**

The agenda was accepted as presented.

**AUDIENCE COMMENTS**

**Bill Phipps, Edmonds**, said he supports a strong Urban Forest Management Plan (UFMP), as well as a strong tree ordinance for trees on private land. He strongly encouraged the City to preserve its existing tree canopy and to add to it. If the areas cannot be purchased by the City, he encouraged the beginning of an Edmonds Land Trust that could fund the purchase of the open spaces that still exist. One that comes to mind is the open space between Seaview Park and Perrinville, which is up for development at this time. He would like that land to be saved forever and added to the City's park land. It is a very ecologically fragile area, with steep land that should not be developed. It would add a nice thoroughfare for wildlife between Perrinville Creek, Southwest County Park and Lynndale Park. His hope is that a strong tree ordinance can be developed because most of the tree canopy is on private land. Three aspects of the tree code should be: limiting the number of trees a private landowner can take down in a given year, requiring replacement trees for those that are removed, and limiting the number of trees a developer can cut down to accommodate a proposed development. Currently, a developer can clear cut all of the trees, and that should not be allowed. He referred to the City of Shoreline's tree code, which limits tree removal associated with development to 80%. He encouraged the City of Edmonds to adopt a similar ordinance.

Mr. Phipps noted the lack of trees in the downtown corridors. While there are nice trees on 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Main Street, there are very few trees on the other downtown streets. When he thinks of a beautiful downtown, he thinks of tree-lined streets.

He suggested that a tree-planting program should be part of the UFMP, as well. Adding to the tree canopy would make the downtown area much more pleasant. He concluded his remarks by reminding the Board that once the open spaces are gone, they are gone for good. He encouraged them to be known for protecting the land. Tree canopy is extremely important when fighting climate change and global warming. He encouraged the Board to recommend approval of a strong UFMP and a strong tree ordinance.

### **DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIRECTOR REPORT TO PLANNING BOARD**

Chair Rubenkonig referred the Board to the written report that was provided by the Development Services Director. Board Member Lovell asked if there was any new information relative to the State Legislature's efforts relative to the capital budget. Ms. Hope reported that, unfortunately, the Legislature dismissed without an agreement on the capital budget, and Governor Inslee has indicated he would not reconvene the Legislature unless it is known that they will come up with a capital budget. This is very concerning to many, including the City of Edmonds, because they have some projects expected to be on the capital budget.

Board Member Lovell referred to the update from Snohomish County Tomorrow (SCT) relative to the Alliance for Housing Affordability, and asked if they are getting close to issuing a report to the City Council. He reminded the Board that the Five Corners Subarea Plan is on hold until the study has been completed. Ms. Hope said the Board's extended agenda includes meetings that will cover housing and the Five Corners Subarea Plan. In preparation for these discussions, staff is working with the Alliance for Housing Affordability to update the City's housing profile information. Staff will provide a report on this effort to the Planning Board on September 13<sup>th</sup>. Board Member Lovell asked if the effort would result in the City Council considering some type of tax incentive relative to low-income housing development on Highway 99. Ms. Hope answered that is a separate discussion, and the City Council recently approved having a public hearing on adding the Highway 99 Subarea into the City's program for multi-family tax deductions. Theoretically, they could take action sometime in August.

Chair Rubenkonig requested an explanation for how the Office of Financial Management (OFM) determined the City's populations projections. Ms. Hope explained that the OFM does population projections every year. They look at a number of factors, including the population at the last determination and any new community data that has been gathered. They also consider the number of mailboxes, building permits, etc. She cautioned that the population projection is an estimate based on an April 1<sup>st</sup> point in time.

### **PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED PLANNED ACTION CODE LANGUAGE FOR HIGHWAY 99 SUBAREA PLAN**

Ms. Hope advised that the Planned Action Ordinance (PAO) before the Board relates to the Highway 99 Subarea Plan. She provided a map of the subarea, which has been subject to study since the beginning of 2016. The intent was to create a plan that had vision and included action items that could be implemented. It recommended a set of Development Code amendments to better implement the Highway 99 Subarea Plan's vision. She cautioned that the PAO before the Board would not change any of their previous work. She explained that the Growth Management Act (GMA) and the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) allow for a "planned action" process to streamline the environmental review process for projects that have already been covered by an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) developed for the subarea. This is, in part, because the EIS will have analyzed impacts of development and identified mitigation measures to address the impacts. To memorialize the EIS work for the subarea, the City may adopt a PAO or code that specifies the type and amount of development that may be allowed to proceed in the subarea without additional SEPA review. All other applicable laws and regulations would still apply. If a project would exceed the thresholds identified in the PAO, additional environmental work would be required to make sure all impacts are considered.

Ms. Hope referred the Board to the draft EIS that was prepared for the PAO and noted that the final EIS will be issued next week. She advised that the draft PAO assumes that the final EIS will be approved, and the final EIS will be done before the Board's recommendation is presented to the City Council. The City Council will have a work session and public hearing before the PAO is approved in its final form.

**APPROVED**

Board Member Lovell clarified that the Board received two documents: a draft PAO ordinance and a PAO mitigation document. Ms. Hope explained that the mitigation document is a supplement to the draft PAO and provides additional explanation. The draft EIS is available online, and has been available for public comment. Two comments were received. One was from the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), which was generally supportive of the PAO. Community Transit also issued a comment in support of the PAO.

Board Member Lovell asked if the concept of a multi-family tax exemption is entirely separate from the draft PAO, and Ms. Hope answered affirmatively.

Ms. Hope advised that the Engineering Department has requested that the two transportation projects identified in the draft PAO (Page 17) should be added to the Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP). One is improvements at SR-99 and 220<sup>th</sup> Street, and the other is at SR-99 and 224<sup>th</sup> Street. In addition, the Traffic Engineer has requested that the language describing the SR-99/224<sup>th</sup> Street Project be updated by adding after “left turn lane,” the following phrase, ‘or an alternative design as confirmed by further study.’ She explained that there may be a better way to solve the issues at this intersection, and the proposed change would allow the City to consider other options.

Chair Rubenkonig referred to Items 3a and 3b on Page 19 of the PAO. She noted that Item 3a identifies a threshold for when the additional trips associated with a project will trigger additional SEPA review. She shared an example of a project with 2,000 PM peak trips followed by another project with 1,000 PM peak trips. Although the total additional trips would be over the limit, neither project would be subject to additional SEPA review. However, it appears that the two projects would move the City into an issue with concurrency as described in Item 3b. Ms. Hope said the basic idea is that once the total limit of 2,755 is reached, any other projects, regardless of the number of trips, would have to be considered under a separate process that would require a regular SEPA review. She emphasized that 2,755 is considered a cumulative cap, and the count would be based on the type of use and the projected PM peak hour trips associated with each project that occurs.

Regarding concurrency, Ms. Hope explained that when a proposed project exceeds the level of service standards adopted in the Comprehensive Plan, GMA requires the City to deny the application, require mitigation so that the level of service will not be exceeded, or allow another alternative that keeps the project from exceeding the level of service standards.

Ms. Hope explained that when a project comes in for a permit, the applicant would still have to fill out a SEPA Checklist, which would be reviewed by staff to make sure the project fits within the parameters of the PAO. If so, no additional SEPA work would be required.

Chair Rubenkonig opened the hearing for public testimony. No one in the audience indicated a desire to participate in the hearing, and the hearing was closed.

Board Member Lovell commented that the draft PAO is a validation of the planning work that was done by the consultants relative to the Highway 99 Subarea Plan, which the Board previously moved on to the City Council with a recommendation of approval. He said he would support moving the PAO forward to the City Council with a recommendation of approval, including the changes proposed by the Traffic Engineer.

**BOARD MEMBER LOVELL MOVED THAT THE BOARD FORWARD THE DRAFT PLANNED ACTION ORDINANCE FOR THE HIGHWAY 99 SUBAREA PLAN TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL AS PRESENTED, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE JULY 26, 2017 STAFF REPORT, WHICH REFLECTS THE BOARD’S MAY 10, 2017 REVIEW, WITH A CONCURRENT PUBLIC HEARING ON JULY 26, 2017. HE FURTHER MOVED THAT THE BOARD RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL LANGUAGE PUT FORWARDED BY THE TRAFFIC ENGINEER IN THE STAGE 2 SECTION OF THE PLANNED ACTION EIS MITIGATION DOCUMENT (EXHIBIT B). BOARD MEMBER ROBLES SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

## UPDATE ON DEVELOPING THE URBAN FOREST MANAGEMENT PLAN

Ms. Hope explained that the City is currently working to develop an Urban Forest Management Plan (UFMP) that will primarily focus on managing trees on public properties and in public rights-of-way. She introduced Ian Scott, Davey Resource Group, who was present to provide an update on the plan.

**Ian Scott, Davey Resource Group**, introduced the other members of the consulting team: Keeley O’Connell with Nature Insight Consulting and Ian Lapport from the Davey Resource Group. He explained that the definition of an urban forest includes both public and private trees within the City limits of Edmonds. Wherever the trees are, they provide benefits to the entire City. The UFMP is being developed as a guiding document for forested land on City properties, public rights-of-way and critical habitat areas. It should fall under the Comprehensive Plan, align with the Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PROS) Plan, and provide an overarching guiding document for the Public Works, Planning and Parks Departments. The plan will contain both long and short-term goals based on adaptive management principles. The intent is that it be a long-term planning document with the expectation that it would go through routine revision exercises over time as community values change.

Mr. Scott said a UFMP is important to promote a shared vision, communicate the value and benefits of trees, and allow multiple city departments to manage all of the challenges and opportunities that come up relative to trees. The plan is intended to create a pathway for pro-active management. The process starts by determining what the City has and wants, and then identifies goals that will help the City move towards its vision.

Mr. Scott reviewed that the process thus far has included stakeholder interviews with the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services staff, Development Services staff, Public Works Staff, and the City’s Tree Board. These meetings have provided opportunities to share thoughts, visions, and challenges with working with trees in the City. The team has also done document research to pull together all code and Comprehensive Plan language related to trees. An Urban Tree Canopy Assessment was completed, and one community visioning session was held on June 22<sup>nd</sup>. The team is poised to release a virtual open house for those who were unable to attend the visioning session.

Mr. Scott stated that the Urban Tree Canopy Assessment started with a 2017 aerial imagery and used a computer-automated process (GIS) to identify the existing tree canopy, impervious surfaces, grass/vegetation, bare soils, and water. As an example, he displayed a graphic of the Edmonds Marsh. He summarized that the results of the assessment show that the City’s tree canopy covers about 30% of the City. He explained that the information obtained via the assessment allows for a GIS overlay on various other mapping elements. For example, the data can be viewed based on:

- **Land Type** (commercial, public and private properties). He noted that 80% of the existing tree canopy is located on private lands, so a good portion of the UFMP will require some volunteer buy-in from the community in order for it to be successful.
- **Forest Fragmentation.** About 190 acres of the forested area is of core canopy that provides for habit for wildlife. For movement, more of this type of canopy is needed. There is a potential for a stronger rebuild moving north to south across the City using perforated canopy and patch canopy.
- **Canopy Benefits.** To date, trees in Edmonds are storing 188,000 tons of carbon, valued at \$6.8 million in environmental benefit or avoided environmental degradation. Annually, trees in Edmonds provide \$1.2 million in stormwater benefits, \$147,000 in air quality improvements, and \$222,000 in carbon sequestration. If the trees are removed, air quality would go down and illness would increase.

Mr. Scott provided a graph to show how the City’s 30% tree canopy compares with other cities in the region. He noted that both Bonney Lake and Lake Forest Park have a 40% canopy cover. The City of Edmonds’ canopy is very similar to that of Shoreline and Redmond.

Lastly, Mr. Scott reviewed the timeline for the project, noting that the consulting team is currently drafting the UFMP, and the online survey is still open. The draft UFMP will be submitted to the City in August and September, and this will be followed by a review period. The consulting team will present the draft plan to the Tree Board, City Council and Planning

Board. There will also be an additional public open house. He stressed the importance of public feedback as the document moves forward. He concluded that a second draft of the UFMP will be available by November, followed by a final draft in December. It is anticipated that the City Council will approve the document in the spring.

Mr. Scott advised that public voting boards were provided at the June 22<sup>nd</sup> open house to solicit public opinion. It appeared that the majority of those in attendance lived in the bowl area, and there was strong concern that the plan would have negative impacts to the Tree Code. Concern was raised about the previously-proposed tree code, and most indicated they did not want the UFMP to go that direction again. He emphasized that the UFMP is not intended to revise City Code, only to propose options that, if desired, would get you down the road into the future. He reviewed the results of the six questions that were asked as follows:

- **What tree benefits do you most appreciate?** Most attendees indicated that water quality, wildlife habitat, air quality and beauty/aesthetics were most important.
- **What types of outreach and education are preferred/valued?** The plan will include a component of education and outreach to change people's attitudes and culture. Attendees specifically recommended education and outreach pertaining to species selection and tree pruning.
- **What is/are your biggest concerns for trees in Edmonds?** Many attendees were concerned about trees blocking views, but others were more concerned about healthy, mature trees being lost, canopy loss, and loss of wildlife habitat.
- **What level of maintenance would you prefer for public trees?** A UFMP can result in increased activity sponsored by the City or it can be reduced, as well. Most people indicated a desire for the City to take care of its hazardous trees, and maintaining access and clearance on roadways. There was no support for doing nothing moving forward, which means they want some level of care from the City.
- **Where would you like to see more trees planted?** Responses were spread nearly even across all of the options (parks, open spaces, commercial properties, streets/medians, parking lots, and private properties). The consultant team translates this to mean that anywhere trees are planted in the City provides a value to the community.
- **What are the best ways to encourage tree planting and preservation on private property?** Most attendees indicated that education and outreach, as well as free or low-cost trees, would be the most effective way of encouraging tree planting and preservation.

Mr. Scott invited the Board Members to share their ideas, for planting more trees along City streets, as well as opportunities for education and community building. He also invited them to voice their issues and concerns. In addition, he encouraged Board Members to participate in the on-line survey, which can be found at <https://surveymonkey.com/r/EdmondsUFMP.com>. For more information about the value and benefit of trees, he encouraged them to visit the following websites: <https://treesaregood.org>, <https://www.treebenefits.com>, and <https://itreetools.org>.

Board Member Rosen asked how many people attended the public open house, and Mr. Scott answered that about 50 people were in attendance. Board Member Rosen said Mr. Scott noted a 2.3% decrease in the City's tree canopy since 2005 and asked if this represents a steady decline or was it caused by a single event. Mr. Scott answered that the methodology is not conclusive on cause. Board Member Rosen asked if the analysis identifies where the losses occurred. Mr. Scott replied that the change analysis was a statistical exercise that did not produce a map. Board Member Rosen asked how the City's current rate of tree canopy loss compares to that of other jurisdictions. Mr. Scott said he does not have that information.

Board Member Lovell commented that much of the information presented to the Planning Board could be considered "off the shelf." He said he attended the 1<sup>st</sup> public open house and filled out a comment card, as did a number of other people who attended. However, the consultant's presentation did not include any of the comments received to date. For example, some people suggested that the City hire a full-time arborist, and it is likely that someone else suggested that the City create an Open Lands Trust Fund. He suspects that a number of comments were received suggesting that the City not regulate trees on private property. Mr. Scott agreed that the presentation was somewhat "off the shelf." He noted that a summary was

prepared of the public comments received at the meeting, and they will be considered as part of the planning process. Board Member Lovell asked if the comments received to date represent any sort of trend. Mr. Scott said a number of people have come forward voicing opposition to regulating trees on private property. There is also a number of people who are passionate about trees and want to regulate trees on private property. He said he is hoping the online survey will provide a greater indication of public sentiment. There is no urgency to close the survey at this time, and they are hoping to get more people to respond.

Vice Chair Monroe referred to the goals that were presented by Mr. Scott. He suggested that rather than “placing trees in Edmonds,” a more appropriate goal would be to “place the right trees in Edmonds.” He noted that some of the public trees are not the right species, and they end up invading sidewalks and sewer systems. This should be addressed in the plan. He also noted that, although the consultant provided a slide indicating the “benefits” of trees, there was no information about the “costs.” Mr. Scott responded that the consulting team is working with data from the Public Works and Parks Department to address the costs associated with the care of trees. The biggest challenge is that the City does not have an inventory of the existing trees they are spending money on or trees that have unresolved issues. The only data he has found is a list of all the sidewalks that are heaving, likely caused by trees. He said the plan will include a list of trees that are subject to mortality because they are not in the correct place for the species.

Vice Chair Monroe asked how the UFMP and Tree Plan would impact the Highway 99 Subarea Plan. Ms. Hope recalled that the Highway 99 Subarea Plan talks about using the City’s Street Tree Plan as an indicator of the types of trees that should be planted. The Street Tree Plan has a section that specifically refers to the Highway 99 Subarea, but it needs to be updated at some point in the near future. Information provided in the UFMP could inform this update. Mr. Scott said it is important to recognize that the UFMP will be a strategic plan for the City, and the elements contained in the Street Tree Plan are more operational planning tools. For example, to learn the right trees to plant along a street boulevard, you would go to a tree planting pallet list contained in the Street Tree Plan. The UFMP will refer to the recommended tree planting list contained in the Street Tree Plan.

Board Member Robles asked if the aerial photographs are only a data point, or are there other means for measuring trees, such as measuring the mass of the tree stock to determine the difference between a shrub and a large tree. Mr. Scott said the analysis used a multi-spectral imagery, which differentiates between tree canopy and low-lying vegetation. He agreed to provide more information about how the differences are identified on the maps.

Rather than imposing more barriers on development, Board Member Robles asked if there are incentives the City could offer to developers to retain trees or build structures that are not susceptible to tree damage. He recalled that the Board is also working on an emerging “aging in place” plan that would allow property owners to build an extra dwelling unit on a single-family lot, saving it from being redeveloped to a greater density. This would result in tree retention, as well. He asked if the consultant has considered other tangential activities that could have an impact on the City’s effort to retain trees. Mr. Scott answered that the UFMP would not reach that level of detail, but it may describe some incentives to encourage alternative building placement to encourage retention of larger trees. Another solution that other cities are exploring is developing a type of “tree bank.” This would allow developers of properties that do not have enough space to accommodate trees to pay into a fund for planting to occur in another part of the City.

Board Member Robles asked if the canopy analysis accounts for tree growth. Mr. Scott answered no and explained that the analysis can only describe the quantity of a forest and not the quality. He has heard reports from the Parks Department that there are a number of alder trees that are aging and in decline. They are having to spend a significant amount of money to replace them. He explained that the mortality rate for the urban forest canopy would require some additional study, and it is very typical for a city to move from a canopy study to a tree inventory as a benchmark for studying tree growth. Board Member Robles commented that if the City has an idea of how much the trees are growing, it will also have a better idea of how many are being lost. This would allow them to better structure the plan to address the delta. He said he is looking forward to seeing a higher level of data at some point in the future. Mr. Scott said the scope of the current project is to establish some benchmarks, identifying what the City has and does not have. This additional information will likely be identified as a goal item in the UFMP.

Board Member Robles suggested that the UFMP could recommend a program that allows property owners to self-register the trees on their property. Given that trees grow at a certain rate, property owners could receive credits for tree growth. Mr.

Scott said there is a lot of precedence for this approach with the citizen science movements going on. With the advent of handheld mobile devices, they are able connect property owners to the trees on their property and give them ways to participate in the fact-finding process. Board Member Robles suggested that this concept be included in the list of things the City wants to do.

Board Member Lovell asked if there is anything the consultant can show the Board that represents what the final report will look like. Mr. Scott referred to the City of Kirkland's UFMP, which was recently done by his firm. He agreed to provide a link to the document. There is emerging research and precedence in the industry that will provide guidance for the plan.

Board Member Lovell commented that there is a strong interest that emerges to compare Edmonds with other cities in the region. It would be helpful to have information showing what the cities that have greater tree canopy than Edmonds look like in 2017. A lot of development has occurred in these communities since 2011 and 2012, and their tree canopy has likely decreased as a result. Mr. Scott said each of the cities pay for the analysis to be done, and he can only provide information from cities that have made their findings publicly accessible. The comparison provided in his presentation was based on the knowledge he had from doing work in the cities. Board Member Lovell asked if the City could order a colored graphic spectrum analysis from the cities included in the comparison. Mr. Scott said it would be uncommon, but the City could certainly do that. On the flip side, he would expect that most of the cities would be updating their analysis by 2022. Another way that cities keep an eye on canopy change is via permit processes. Although the permits may not require tree retention, noting it on the application would at least provide the City with a record of the number of trees lost.

Board Member Rosen asked if there is an ideal percentage for tree canopy based on best management practices and expert knowledge. Mr. Scott answered no. The ideal percentage varies from city to city. American Forests used to promote a 40% tree canopy that every City should have as a goal, but they have since retracted to recognize that different cities have different capabilities. Vice Chair Monroe summarized that Lake Forest Park's 40% canopy may not be better, it is just different. Mr. Scott agreed and added that Lake Forest Park has a different character than Edmonds.

Board Member Robles noted that the United States Forest Service (USFS) does Lydar surveys of their assets, and perhaps cities could get together to fund a similar study. Mr. Scott agreed that is possible. He noted that USFS ran a Forest Inventory Assessment in 2013 for not only forested lands, but various urban areas, as well. This information is available to the public. Board Member Robles asked if this type of study would be a better asset than the City's current methodology. Mr. Scott answered affirmatively, because it talks about the quality of the forest. The condition assessment is missing from the Urban Tree Canopy (UTC) survey, but the UTC survey is still very cost effective. Board Member Robles commented that, although it would be too costly for Edmonds to do its own Lydar survey, perhaps cities could get together to perform a Lydar survey on a larger stretch of land. Mr. Scott suggested that Lydar is becoming more accessible and definitely will be part of the future. Mr. Chave noted that the City has done some Lydar work, and it is available online.

Board Member Cloutier said he appreciates that the objective of the UFMP is not to maximize the tree canopy, which would be impractical, but to find the right balance. It's important to make this clear to the public because there tends to be a reflexive reaction of "all or nothing" either way. He reminded the Board that the City Council recently adopted a resolution supporting the Paris Climate Accord. As part of that resolution, there were specific objectives for having Edmonds transition to a completely carbon-free energy source. Given the City's location, that pretty much means solar energy. He suggested that efforts to promote the use of solar photovoltaic energy should be done in conjunction with efforts to increase or find an optimal tree canopy. He noted that concerns about trees shading yards could be related to the need for solar access for energy or for gardens. He expressed his belief that the Street Tree Plan will need to be revised in concert with implementation of the UFMP.

Board Member Cloutier suggested the UFMP should also include another tier of vegetation other than the very large trees. For example, someone with a solar easement may still want vegetation on the ground. This would provide all of the benefits that vegetation provides, just not at the scale of a huge Douglas Fir. Mr. Scott said the challenge is that woody plants will sequester carbons, but not as much because they don't have the same leaf area. Studies show that while it is a challenge to grow large trees in the urban environment, they provide the most long-term benefits. Board Member Cloutier expressed his belief that "halfway there is better than none." Again, he suggested that another tier of vegetation be considered in places where a massive tree is not appropriate. Mr. Scott said the UFMP will be strategic, allowing the City to make decisions that

certain trees need to be removed. Planting trees in other places will allow the City to balance the canopy out to create a sustainable urban forest. Right now, the City does not have adequate information to make these balanced decisions.

Due to the way the City is oriented towards the water, Board Member Cloutier cautioned that anything that affects views will multiply any opinion by 1,000. Views will be the primary consideration for most people. Chair Rubenkönig pointed out that trees planted within the public rights-of-way have obscured the views of the Sound that was once enjoyed.

Chair Rubenkönig commented that the Board is interested in facts, which will inform them as to the best way to address the concerns raised by the citizens relative to trees in Edmonds. While she appreciates the information provided by the consultant, she felt it would be helpful to have a historic overview of what has happened with the tree canopy over time. Perhaps this could start with the 1960s photograph in the Public Works Building that shows how well treed the downtown area was. They need to look at what has been done to the tree canopy as a result of the City's policies and the way that business has been conducted. This information would help the Board consider the changes that are needed for the future. Mr. Scott said the challenge with digging that far back is that aerial imagery from that period is black and white and not as detailed. It is a safe assumption that the entire area was originally forested and later settled. The Planning Department has indicated that most of the City has been developed at this point, and it is a matter of zoning amendments that have allowed for greater density and resulted in loss of tree canopy. Chair Rubenkönig agreed that different tools would need to be used, but she would like historic information to be part of the report.

Chair Rubenkönig said she does not consider the City's 30% tree canopy to be good enough. She suggested that the City of Kirkland may have a greater percentage of tree canopy because they have a stronger tree policy within their development regulations. She commented that her firm has worked on development projects in the City of Kirkland, and she knows that they require a much higher tree retention, as does the City of Redmond. She summarized that the cities with greater tree canopies may be reflective of more stringent tree retention policies.

Chair Rubenkönig suggested that in addition to addressing the issue of "planting the right tree in the right place," the UFMP should also address using the right installation for trees that are planted. If a tree is planted in the right way within a sidewalk area, it can prosper. Improper installation is often the cause of trees impacting sidewalks. She noted that, via the survey and community open house, the public has indicated a desire for more educational information on how to plant trees correctly. Mr. Scott commented that the UFMP can create great opportunities for community engagement by giving the City direction towards setting up these relationships so that citizens can become stewards of their own land.

Chair Rubenkönig stressed the need for benchmark figures from the consulting team. She recalled that when the Board conducted a public hearing on the Tree Board's previous recommendation, she got the feeling that citizens take trees very seriously, particularly those on their own property. Most people have good intent to be good stewards of the land. However, a lot of tree cutting has occurred in recent years as a result of people becoming afraid after major windstorms have occurred. Many have felt the need to protect their properties.

Ms. Hope reminded the Board that the UFMP will come back to them for future work as the plan progresses. It will also be presented again to the Tree Board. There will be a number of opportunities for the Board and members of the public to comment as the plan progresses.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business.

### **REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA**

Ms. Hope reviewed the Board's extended agenda, noting that the August 9<sup>th</sup> agenda will include a presentation on completion of the Sustainable Cities Partnership with Western Washington University (WWU). She reviewed that the WWU students and faculty did a tremendous amount of work, and highlights of their work will be presented to the Board. The highlights will also be made available online. The second item on the August 9<sup>th</sup> agenda is a presentation of information that has recently been published about growth trends in the Central Puget Sound Region. This information will help provide context for how Edmonds is performing as part of the larger region.

**APPROVED**

Ms. Hope advised that the August 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting was cancelled for summer break. The September 13<sup>th</sup> agenda will include a presentation on “Taming BigFoot”, regarding climate change. It will include a report on what the City has already done with regard to climate change, as well as what the City could do moving forward. The September 13<sup>th</sup> agenda will also include an update on the City’s Housing Strategy effort, as well as a status report on the Five Corners Area Development Feasibility Analysis.

Ms. Hope reviewed that the September 27<sup>th</sup> agenda will include an update and discussion on sustainability activities, as well as a study session on the 2017 Comprehensive Plan amendments. She noted that the amendments will be minor, including some land use designation changes and language changes related to the Highway 99 Subarea Plan. The study session on Comprehensive Plan amendments will carry forward to the October 11<sup>th</sup> meeting. On October 25<sup>th</sup>, the staff and consultant will present the final report on the Five Corners Area Development Feasibility Analysis. This could be a joint meeting with the Economic Development Commission.

Ms. Hope continued that the November 8<sup>th</sup> agenda will include an update on the Housing Strategy effort, as well as an opportunity to review the draft UFMP. The second meeting in November will be cancelled to accommodate the holiday. She noted that the extended agenda is susceptible to change as special circumstances arise.

Chair Rubenkönig commented that the Board also anticipated having a joint meeting with the City Council to discuss issues related to the Housing Strategy. Ms. Hope agreed that is an option, and would likely occur as part of a City Council agenda.

Chair Rubenkönig said the Board also considered a joint meeting with the Architectural Design Board, but they do not have a particular subject to discuss. Mr. Chave suggested that they review the Development Regulations that pertain to design. Board Member Lovell said it might be worthwhile to have a discussion related to design standards for low or affordable housing that might occur on Highway 99. He suspects that developers will propose projects that could lead to some less than architecturally-pleasing housing on Highway 99. Ms. Hope pointed out that the current draft code amendments for the Highway 99 Subarea Plan include architectural design standards. However, it may be appropriate to look at the design standards for other districts in the City. Chair Rubenkönig pointed out that the Board has a full agenda for the remainder of the year, and it is not likely that a joint meeting with the Architectural Design Board will occur in 2017.

**PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS**

Chair Rubenkönig reminded the Board that the second meeting in August was cancelled.

**PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS**

There were no Board Member comments.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The Board meeting was adjourned at 8:48 p.m.