



**PORT COMMISSION OF THE PORT OF EDMONDS**  
**MINUTES OF SPECIAL COMMISSION MEETING AND STAFF**  
**RETREAT**

**February 25, 2019**

---

---

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT**

Steve Johnston, President  
Jim Orvis, Vice President (by phone)  
Angela Harris, Secretary  
Bruce Faires  
David Preston

**STAFF PRESENT**

Bob McChesney, Executive Director  
Marla Kempf, Deputy Director  
Brian Menard, Facilities Maintenance Manager  
Brittany Williams, Properties and Marketing Manager  
Karin Michaud, Office Manager  
Tina Drennan, Finance Manager  
Renae Ebel, Administrative Assistant

**OTHERS PRESENT**

Bradford Cattle, Port Attorney

**CALL TO ORDER**

President Johnston called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

All those in attendance participated in the Pledge of Allegiance to the American Flag.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

**COMMISSIONER FAIRES MOVED THAT THE CONSENT AGENDA BE APPROVED TO INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS:**

- A. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
- B. APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 11, 2019 MEETING MINUTES**
- C. APPROVAL OF PAYMENTS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$155,575.93**

**COMMISSIONER PRESTON SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no public comments.

## PUBLIC ACCESS PLAN

Ms. Williams reviewed that, in 2018, a member of the public brought forth the idea of improving the Port's promenade to better its aesthetic look and usability. The staff and Commissioners agreed it was important to invest in the promenade, as it is the aspect of the Port that is most commonly used by the public. On January 14<sup>th</sup>, the Commission authorized staff to enter into a contract with MAKERS Architecture and Urban Design LLP to help develop a plan for moving forward. At that time, the Commission emphasized the need for public involvement, and a Public Access Plan Steering Committee was formed with the following participants: Dean Nichols (idea originator, marina tenant and Woodway resident), Guy Schoonmaker (tenant and Edmonds resident), Chris Olson (tenant and Edmonds Yacht Club representative), Greg Bough (tenant and Edmonds Yacht Club representative), Carrie Hite (Edmonds Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director), Ross Dimmick (Edmonds resident and tenant), Bob Bengford (MAKERS), Sean McCormick (MAKERS), Julie Bassuk (MAKERS), Brittany Williams (Port of Edmonds), Bob McChesney (Port of Edmonds), Marla Kempf (Port of Edmonds) and Angela Harris (Port Commissioner). Ms. Williams advised that the steering committee held its first meeting on January 29<sup>th</sup>, which provided an opportunity to discuss the current state of the promenade and identify potential areas for improvement. The consultants from MAKERS have been invited to share the feedback that was received during the initial steering committee meeting, as well as more information about the process, timeline, and initial ideas for improvements.

**Bob Bengford, MAKERS Architecture and Urban Design LLP**, shared background information about himself, as well as Julie Bassuk and Sean McCormick. He advised that the purpose of the presentation was to reaffirm the issues and priorities and solicit feedback and guidance from the Commission relative to priorities. Following the meeting, the steering committee will further develop the concepts and prepare a preliminary plan. The goal is to present the preliminary plan to the Commission within the next few months and have final plan approval mid-year. He reviewed that the objectives of the project are to beautify the Port and refresh and modernize the promenade.

Commissioner Faires recalled that the impetus for the project was to do a better job with public amenities and improve the public's enjoyment of the waterfront. He stressed the importance of involving the owners of the Port (Port District Taxpayers) in the process to find out what they see as aesthetic and functional improvements. Commissioner Johnston agreed and asked if the Port has collected any ideas from the public yet. Mr. McChesney responded that extensive public outreach was not part of MAKERS' initial scope of work. The public process was reduced down to the steering committee for practical purposes, but that does not foreclose the opportunity to gather more public input.

There was continued discussion about the best way to solicit feedback and ideas from the public, and it was agreed that the best approach to obtain objective feedback would be to expand the scope of work (MAKERS) to include a more extensive public outreach program. They also agreed it would be helpful for the Commissioners to talk with people who are using the promenade to solicit their unfiltered opinions and for the Port to publish articles in the local newspapers announcing that the Port is soliciting ideas for potential improvements at the waterfront. Staff should be invited to provide input and ideas, as well. Commissioner Harris cautioned that the Port should set some clear parameters relative to the scope of the project when soliciting comments and ideas from the public.

Mr. Bengford said the committee's general consensus was that the project is more than cosmetic, but they don't want to make expensive structural changes. The Port has an obligation to make the marina attractive, and public safety is a top priority. There is also a desire to provide a more consistent experience along the walkway. He briefly shared examples of improvements that have been made at other marinas.

**Sean McCormick and Julie Bassuk, MAKERS Architecture and Urban Design LLP**, discussed some of the design elements that might be incorporated into the Port's promenade:

- **Promenade Surfaces.** Ms. Bassuk said the existing promenade surface is a mixture of wood decking, aggregate concrete and pavers. The surface is uneven and especially difficult for strollers and wheelchairs. She identified specific sections (wood decking and aggregate concrete) that should be improved both for aesthetics and safety. The group discussed the pros and cons of several options, including wood, synthetic plastic, poured-in-place concrete, pre-cast concrete planks, galvanized metal grating, fiberglass reinforced grating, and pavers. They agreed that both the wood and aggregate concrete sections should be priorities. They discussed using stamped concrete over the existing aggregate concrete to match more closely with whatever material is used to replace the

wood sections. Mr. Bengford agreed to talk with staff to learn more about the current structural elements that might impact the type of surface material that is used.

- **Railings.** Ms. Bassuk observed that there are a variety of T railing styles and materials used throughout the walkway (painted wood, wood with galvanized metal rails, and galvanized steel). It was noted that it is difficult to maintain and paint the existing railings, and replacing them would reduce maintenance costs, increase durability and improve aesthetics. It was suggested that a post and cable option would be easy to maintain and less costly to install. Ms. Drennan commented that a recent insurance inspection recommended against horizontal bars because kids can climb on them and fall over the top. Examples of a variety of options were provided for the Commission to comment on, and they indicated they were interested in a more urban and less industrial look.
- **Landscaping.** Ms. Bassuk commented that landscaping can make a big difference in terms of aesthetics, maintenance and access. The existing planters physically and visually constrict the promenade. They are heavy and hard to move and there are better options. She shared a variety of examples of how other marinas have used landscaping to improve the appearance of their walkways. Options include narrower metal or synthetic planters that are used consistently along the walkway and integrating landscaping into the screening. The Commission agreed that landscaping is one of the most cost-effective improvements they can make.
- **Gateways.** Ms. Bassuk said the current gateways are fairly large structures that intrude into the walkway and are unwelcoming. Several examples were provided of options that could be considered, and they discussed the pros and cons of each of the different styles. Maintenance issues were of particular concern with the glass options. The Commissioners agreed that the existing gateways are unwelcoming, and they wanted to see more options. They discussed that, in addition to maintenance and durability of look over time, security should also be a consideration. They discussed the pros and cons of a cardlock system and concurred that it would be appropriate to also consider replacing the existing keylock system if the gates are replaced. Ms. Bassuk summarized that the Commission is looking for a gate system that provides the needed security but simplifies the amount of structure from a visual standpoint. Perhaps a screened option would work as opposed to glass. The consultants were asked to research options where the gates slide back and forth as opposed to swinging in or out.
- **Recycling and Trash.** Ms. Bassuk explained that the existing recycling and refuse containers obstruct the promenade, and improvements can make a significant difference. The Commissioners voiced particular concern about the current north marina situation. They reviewed the Trash and Recycling Plan that was done about 15 years ago. Ms. Kempf noted that the plan was never implemented in the north end because of cost and parking factors. It was commented that the enclosures at the south marina are fine, but the recycling containers are often contaminated with refuse. It was agreed that providing two dumpsters for garbage and a tote for recycling, along with adequate signage, seems to work best. A comment was made that it is better to have several containers placed throughout the marina to provide easy access. Ms. Bassuk commented that while placing the containers along the promenade is convenient, it detracts from the appearance. She suggested that, rather than a dumpster, smaller trash and recycling receptacles could be placed along the promenade and the dumpsters could be relocated to create a better pedestrian experience. Mr. McChesney noted that the sidewalk and landscaped area by the Travelift lane could be repurposed and used as a recycling and trash station. The large enclosure outside of the Administration Building could be moved to that location.
- **Lighting.** Because of the promenade's proximity to the water, Mr. Bengford said the idea is to minimize the amount of glare and still light. Right now, there are a lot of overhead lights that create a very light/dark environment. It would likely be easy to retrofit some of the existing facilities to provide some low-level lighting. A low-elevation light on the railing could be a thread that runs throughout the entire promenade, blending the different railing styles together. Commissioner Preston voiced concern that the view at night is limited by the dock lights. Ms. Williams agreed to provide photographs to illustrate the night situation. It was suggested that the consultants research options for diffusing the LED lights so the light spreads out onto the docks.
- **Other Issues.** Mr. Bengford advised that art framework was identified as an important element to consider. Commissioner Harris commented that the goal is to use art to create a focal point that is perhaps tied into the plaza. Mr. Bengford said the committee identified signage as a need, particularly wayfinding and interpretive

signage, and gateway elements are needed, as well. Parking is always a concern when considering reconfiguration options, and utilities must be integrated into the design of any new elements, too.

Ms. Williams summarized that she would work with the consultants to prepare a public survey and send some photographs of the marina at night to provide a perspective of the current lighting situation. The consultant will work with staff to address structural questions related to the docks, and she would provide them with a digital copy of the Port's Landscape Plan. She would also have a follow-up conversation with the consultant relative to public outreach.

Commissioner Faires questioned if it would be appropriate to expand the scope of the project to include community involvement relative to the walkway around the marsh, which is adjacent to the Harbor Square property. He suggested there might be some tie-ins between the two projects, but recognized that the Edmonds Marsh Walkway is under the City's jurisdiction. The Commissioners agreed that the two are separate issues.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING AND POLICIES**

### **Stormwater Filtration Pilot Project**

Ms. Kempf reviewed that at their 2018 retreat, the Facilities Maintenance Manager introduced a filtration cartridge that could potentially be used to filter stormwater. The Commission requested that staff test the cartridge, and a pilot project at the dry storage area was initiated during the 2018/2019 rainy season. Landau Associates, with assistance from Port maintenance staff, procured water samples to establish a baseline and then installed the cartridges in specific outfalls. Further water sample results were documented to determine whether the cartridges would be successful in purifying stormwater. She introduced Joe Kalmar from Landau Associates, who was the project lead and present to provide an overview.

Mr. McChesney provided a diagram to illustrate the stormwater catchment area, which he emphasized is much broader than just Port properties. The diagram shows all of the stormwater infrastructure that is on Port property and how it all ties together.

**Joe Kalmar, Landau Associates**, reviewed that crushed oyster shell has been demonstrated to be effective to remove copper and zinc from stormwater at the Port's boatyard, and it is also known that copper and zinc are the general urban stormwater pollutants (brake dust, tire wear, galvanized metals, etc.). The purpose of the pilot project was to determine the effectiveness of oyster shell when deployed in low-cost retrievable cartridges installed in catch basins in other Port drainage areas. He provided a generalized vault schematic to illustrate how oyster shell has been used in the workyard, noting that the shell has to be removed by a vactor truck once each year. The cartridges, on the other hand, can be easily retrieved and disposed of without the use of a vactor truck, and the cases can be reused with fresh oyster shell. However, because it was a different approach, its effectiveness was unknown and a test was needed.

Mr. Kalmar provided photographs and explained how Port staff placed 4 or 5 canisters in each of the test catch basins. The Commissioners asked clarifying questions about how the canisters work to filter the stormwater that flows through the catch basins.

Commissioner Faires observed that the pilot project is an effort to improve stormwater before it is discharged into Puget Sound. While the boatyard permit requires the stormwater from the boatyard to be filtered, there is no such requirement for filtering the other stormwater that flows through the catch basins on Port property.

Mr. Kalmar provided a map showing the pilot test sample locations, noting that baseline samples were done before the oyster shell canisters were placed. He explained that the plan was to do one baseline monitoring event prior to oyster shell deployment and three post-installation monitoring events. Results for the first three testing events are available, but the results are not yet available for the fourth. Mr. McChesney clarified that the catch basins and outfall sites that are part of the pilot program are located in the dry storage area and are not connected to the City's municipal stormwater system. The Port is not required to test these drains.

Mr. Kalmar shared the test results, which show that, overall, the shell canisters are effective in reducing both copper and zinc contaminants from the stormwater. The copper and zinc levels dropped from November to December, despite having high known influent concentrations. Some of the numbers were slightly higher in the January test, which could

be attributed to the shell losing its ability to absorb the contaminants, as well as dirt solids building up in the catch basins. Removing the dirt and keeping the solid and metal levels in the catch basins down is important. Exposure to a higher level of pollutants will require that the shell be replaced more often.

Commissioner Johnston asked about the level of effort required to change out the shells in the canisters. Mr. Menard said it is the least costly approach because it does not require a vactor. It cost roughly \$3,000 just to clean the vault at the boatyard. Vactoring the outfall sites is costly, and he would like to eliminate the need as much as possible. Staff can quickly remove the old shell from the canisters and replace it with new.

Mr. Kalmar cautioned that stormwater sampling can be highly variable, particularly when a significant stormwater event follows a long, dry spell. Once the results of the third sample event are available, they will have more conclusive information. But so far, the results are promising.

Ms. Kempf concluded that the Port may be able to use what they learn in the test pilot program in other areas of the Port. Commissioner Faires suggested they also work to expand its application to other areas of the State. Commissioner Johnston said one opportunity would be to report on the program at the Washington Public Port Association's (WPPA) Environmental Seminar. It was discussed that additional data is available from a few other marinas that have implemented the basic oyster shell concept in some form or another. However, it was noted that the cannister approach seems to be one of the most cost-effective.

Ms. Kempf advised that when the results of the final test are available, staff will make a final presentation to the Commission and discuss opportunities for possible expansion. She concluded that zinc and copper pollutants will continue to be a problem until viable substitutes are found for galvanized metal, brake pads, etc. It is important to make sure the water that comes from Port property is as clean as possible before it is discharged into the Sound. The oyster shell canisters offer a solution while work continues on developing substitute products.

**Greg Bough, Edmonds Yacht Club,** asked how frequently the oyster shell canisters would be changed out and if they would all be replaced at the same time. Commissioner Preston answered that the maintenance schedule has not yet been determined. Based on the Port's past experience with oyster shell in the boatyard, Ms. Kempf said the Port will now clean out the vault and replace the oyster shell twice each year. They will continue to sample as they work to develop a preventative maintenance plan for the canisters.

Commissioner Preston asked if the oyster shells could be cleaned and reused or if there are other materials that would be just as effective. He voiced concern about how sustainable the option is as the concept is used more and more. Mr. Kalmar said that sometimes just shaking or shuffling the shell to expose new surface area can increase its absorption capacity. There are also commercially-made materials that are costlier. Oyster shell seems to be the most cost-effective metal absorption product available at this time.

Mr. Menard said he is contemplating the option of making larger canisters that hold more shells. It seems that the more oyster shells in the vault, the better the conclusion. Mike Shaw, public, raised concern that the more efficient the oyster shells perform, the higher the concentration of pollutant and the more likely it will be classified as moderately-toxic waste rather than disposable waste. Mr. Kalmer said that even in the boatyard where the concentration of copper and zinc is high, testing shows the levels do not exceed the criteria for being classified as disposable waste. The State also has criteria for dangerous waste, and the toxicity of zinc and copper are included in that formula that tests for total metals. The Port's zinc and copper levels have generally fallen below that level. In addition, bioassay tests that expose fish to the waste have found that it is not classified as state dangerous waste because it has no shown toxicity to fish. Essentially, the metal is not actually available even though it is in high concentrations in the shell. Between these two sets of protocol for testing, the waste shell has been determined to be nothing more than solid waste.

Mr. Kalmer said he will report back to the Commission once the third set of test results are available. Hopefully, they will verify the trend of the first two tests. If so, the Commission should discuss the economics of continuing the program and even expanding it to other areas of the Port. He may have enough data to recommend a replacement frequency, as well.

Mr. McChesney asked if continuing the pilot project through one more rainy season would allow the Port to get a better handle on the situation. Mr. Kalmer agreed that would be appropriate given the variability of stormwater in general. Mr. McChesney said this would allow them to test Mr. Menard's thought of using a larger canister. Commissioner Faires said he would be interested in what would happen if the canisters are shaken up after each significant storm.

### **Groundskeeping Chemicals**

Ms. Kempf reviewed that during 2018, the subject of chemicals used for landscape maintenance purposes was reviewed on several occasions. The conclusions were that the Port applies chemicals sparingly and application is done by licensed applicators and in accordance with specific product recommendations. As part of the Port's environmental stewardship mission, staff will be establishing a pilot project to determine the effectiveness of alternative chemicals. She advised that Mr. Menard was present to review the Port's policies and procedures, licenses and applications, a plan for an alternative analysis and the pilot project.

Mr. Menard noted that there has been turnover in the landscape position, and they are currently in the process of getting the new employee certified for spray applications. It is anticipated he will receive his Public Operator's License and accompanying endorsements (Washington Pesticide Laws and Safety License, Environmental Weed Principles Endorsement, Vegetation Management Endorsement and Aquatic Pest Control Endorsement) in March. With the success of passing his tests, he will be the Port's applicator going forward.

Mr. Menard explained that, currently, products (Roundup and Crossbow) are used sparingly, and the biggest use is to control weed vegetation that comes up through the cracks of asphalt sidewalks and other areas where staff cannot physically remove the weeds and roots. The Dry Storage area was chosen as the test location because it best represents what they are trying to do with the applied herbicides. Currently, there is asphalt around the perimeter of the storage racks and gravel underneath the racks. In this location, staff can control the environment and the public does not have access. As proposed, Roundup would be used on Row A, Rodeo on Row B, Horticulture Vinegar on Row C and Crossbow on Row D. The study will determine the effectiveness of each of the four products and identify whether the more environmentally-friendly products (Rodeo and horticulture vinegar) will do the job.

Commissioner Johnston asked why Landau Associates recommended Rodeo, and Mr. Kalmar said the product has been tested and shown success in other locations, and it has less residual effect than Roundup and Crossbow. **Greg Bough** added that in the dry storage application where the area is primarily shaded, using the spot methodology to apply the Rodeo product will have minimal environmental implications. He offered to advise the Port staff as the test program moves forward.

Mr. McChesney asked if there is an analytical methodology the Port could use to confirm and validate the study results. Mr. Bough and Mr. Kalmer agreed to help the Port establish a scientific basis for the study conclusions.

Commissioner Preston suggested that another option is to use a propane torch to eliminate the weeds. Mr. Menard agreed that is an option, but it is more labor intensive. Mr. Bough cautioned that approach opens the door to other issues.

Mr. McChesney said the pilot study will begin in the spring, and Mr. Menard said the current task is to make sure the employee receives all of his certifications.

**Mike Shaw** noted that the City is switching exclusively to using Avenger, which is a citrus oil based application. He suggested the Port considering using this product in their pilot program, too. Mr. McChesney agreed that Row D could be split to create a Row E, where the Avenger product could be tested.

**Lora Petso** asked why Roundup is even being used in the pilot study. She recognized that the intent is to determine if the other products are as effective as Roundup, but do they need to be as effective as Roundup if they still get the job done? Her assumption is that the goal of the pilot study is to move away from Roundup. The Commissioners discussed if the project is intended to simply be a comparison study or if the goal is to get rid of Roundup entirely and figure out which of the alternatives work better. The Commission agreed to include Roundup in the test as a baseline, as long as it is clear that the intent is to eliminate the use of Roundup entirely.

**Greg Bough, Edmonds Yacht Club**, asked what aquatic pesticides the Port currently uses and how the chemicals impact the environment. Mr. Menard clarified that, although the Port's employee will obtain an Aquatics Pesticide Endorsement, the Port does not currently use and has no plans to use aquatic pesticides. The endorsement will help the employee understand how all of the chemicals impact aquatic plant and animal life.

### **Climate Change and Sea Level Rise**

Mr. McChesney commented that the remaining items on the retreat agenda will focus on facilities and long-range planning, and a recurring theme relative to these topics is climate change and sea level rise. This discussion will focus on how climate change and sea level rise can be incorporated into Port activities and policies. He invited Commissioner Harris to lead the discussion that includes examples from other Ports and the City of Edmonds, suggested next steps, and recommended updates to the Port's environmental initiative. He emphasized that while every port has a different situation and strategy, climate change and sea level rise is a recurring theme at all of the port seminars he has attended in recent years. There is no one solution, but it is on everyone's radar.

Commissioner Harris provided an overview of the information she collected from the environmental plans of the Ports of San Diego, Olympia, Everett and Vancouver, as well as the City of Edmonds:

- The **Port of San Diego** has a very robust environmental climate plan and participates in the Green Marine Certification Program. Their plan includes many elements that would not make sense for a marina-only port, and the ones that do make sense have already been implemented in the Green Port Policy and Initiatives.
- The **Port of Olympia's** program is a work in progress and focuses on four key areas: remediation, regulatory compliance, restoration and recreation, and sustainability. It includes some information on sea level rise and encourages a joint approach for planning with the City of Olympia and the Clean Water Alliance to develop a response plan for protecting the downtown area.
- The **Ports of Everett and Vancouver** have similar environmental policies, but nothing specifically on sea level rise and climate change.
- The **City of Edmonds** has a Climate Action Committee and a Climate Element in its Comprehensive Plan. A lot of data on sea level rise was provided in the Shannon Wilson Report via the Daylighting Willow Creek Project Analysis.

Mr. McChesney pointed out that when the City of Edmonds updated its Critical Areas Ordinance two years ago, it was required to address sea level rise and climate change. They relied on the Revised Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMAs) Floodplain Map and required that the building pad of any structure built inside the floodplain be elevated by two feet. This illustrates that municipalities and ports are all addressing the issue and steps are being taken locally by the City. Change will happen in increments, but there is no clear direction as to time perspective. The Port needs to take these issues into consideration when planning future projects.

Commissioner Harris suggested that the next steps moving forward might include:

- Updating the Port's website to showcase the work the Port is already doing to improve and protect the environment and adding information relative to sea level rise and climate change. It is important to show awareness even though they won't be making drastic changes in the near future. The Environmental and Communications Committees could be assigned this task.
- Evaluating the Port's potential participation in the Green Marine Program. She will research this program to learn more details.
- Evaluating partnerships with the City of Edmonds to leverage climate information and work that the City is already doing. She said she plans to start attending the Climate Action Committee Meetings when possible.

- Adding a section to the Port’s Environmental Policy and Initiatives document. Rather than a specific policy, they could add a statement to raise awareness of climate change, sea level rise and the need to sustainably manage natural resources.
- Continuing outreach via the Environmental Committee to collect data to review and evaluate and to raise public awareness of the Port’s Environmental Policy and Initiatives document.

Commissioner Faires asked if continuing to rely on the City of Edmonds and its zoning regulations will be adequate for the Port or if there are specific issues that are unique to the Port environment that need to be addressed separately. Commissioner Harris responded that she does not have enough information at this point to make that determination, and that is the point of her recommendation to work in partnership with the City of Edmonds. She said she would like to talk with representatives from the Port of Olympia about how their partnership with the City of Olympia works. Commissioner Faires concluded that the long-range goal is to identify areas where the City’s generalities may not apply specifically to the Port. This should become clearer within the next several years.

Council Member Teitzel commented that global warming can be partially addressed by tree canopy, and the City is currently looking at ways to preserve and even enhance the tree canopy in certain areas. This effort will involve adding the right trees in the right places, including trees on Port property, to increase the tree canopy. Mr. McChesney pointed out that most of the Port’s useable land is impervious, but there are a fair number of trees already. He said he is not sure how to factor increased tree canopy into the landscape plan. He noted that trees, particularly those at Harbor Square, will be replaced over time as they grow too large and start to damage infrastructure. The intent is to make sure the right trees are planted to avoid problems in the future.

The meeting was adjourned to a lunch break at about 11:45 p.m. and resumed at 12:06 p.m.

## **FACILITIES PLANNING**

### **Comprehensive Scheme of Harbor Improvements**

Mr. McChesney said the State requires Port Districts to have on hand a Comprehensive Scheme of Harbor Improvements. The Port’s current scheme has three parts: a master plan for the west side, a master plan for the east side (Harbor Square) and a strategic plan. He recalled that the current Harbor Square Redevelopment Plan was summarily rejected and dismissed by the Edmonds City Council after it had already been approved by the Port Commission and the Planning Board. Since that time, the Commission has adopted the policy of operating Harbor Square as it is and they do not anticipate executing the Harbor Square Redevelopment Plan. Harbor Square has done very well over the past few years, and there is no compelling reason for change.

Commissioner Johnston asked if there is any reason for the Commission to retire the plan as opposed to continuing to hold it in abeyance without pursuing it. He cannot imagine a scenario where that particular plan will come to fruition in the future. Mr. McChesney agreed and said the Commission could take formal action to remove it from the Comprehensive Scheme of Harbor Improvements and replace it with a plan to continue operating the property the way it is for the foreseeable future. This would not preclude the Commission’s ability to revisit a master planning effort at Harbor Square in the future.

Commissioner Faires reviewed that the Harbor Square Redevelopment Plan was minimally economically feasible at that time, and the Commission felt it would be in the public’s best interest as a multi-use, transit-oriented community that was consistent with the City’s Comprehensive Plan at the time. The plan was rejected by the City Council and a number of Edmonds citizens. At that time, the Commission agreed to do its best with Harbor Square as it is presently developed. The Harbor Square Redevelopment Plan was retained as an example of what could take place at Harbor Square. He said he would support revising the Harbor Square Redevelopment Plan to retain the status quo, but he still does not believe the present use of Harbor Square is in the best interest of the community and he would support a City decision in the future to allow redevelopment of the property into a mixed-use community that includes residential uses.

There was continued discussion in support of retiring the Harbor Square Redevelopment Plan from the Comprehensive Scheme of Harbor Improvements since there was no plan to further its implementation at this time. They voiced



support for incorporating a statement to the effect that the current configuration and use will be retained until conditions change. Mr. Cattle advised that retiring the Harbor Square Redevelopment Plan would require a resolution and a public hearing.

**COMMISSIONER FAIRES MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION DIRECT STAFF TO UNDERTAKE THE PROPER PROCEDURE WITHIN THE NEXT THREE MONTHS TO REVIEW THE COMPREHENSIVE SCHEME OF HARBOR IMPROVEMENT'S DESIGNATION FOR HARBOR SQUARE. COMMISSIONER PRESTON SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Commissioner Orvis clarified that the Comprehensive Scheme of Harbor Improvements can be as little as a series of documents that say "here's what we are doing," as opposed to having formal master plans.

### **Harbor Square Landscaping at Intersection of SR104 and Dayton Street**

Mr. McChesney reviewed that the Commission previously discussed plans for renovating the entrance at Harbor Square at the intersection of SR-104 and Dayton Street. It was originally thought that the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) owned the property and an extensive amount of time was spent trying to obtain the necessary permission to make the improvements. It was later learned that WSDOT had deeded the property to the City of Edmonds, and the City is now encouraging the Port to move the project forward. They did not have enough manpower to complete the project in 2018, and it is now a high-priority item for Port staff to accomplish the work this spring.

Commissioner Faïres asked if the Port could proceed with the project at its own pace from an administrative perspective, and Mr. McChesney answered affirmatively. The City has not placed any restraints on the project to date.

Mr. McChesney advised that the intent is to create a type of elaborate rain garden, making it look nice without creating a lot of maintenance issues down the line. It will include opportunities for public access through the intersection to Harbor Square and the Edmonds Marsh. The monument sign will be modified to include the "Port of Edmonds."

Mr. Menard advised that the first step is to put down a subgrade, which is weather dependent. He displayed the landscape plan and he and Mr. McChesney described some of its details, such as the types of plants, the walkway plan and bench feature. He noted that the intent is to make the area as maintenance free as possible, but provide vegetation to improve aesthetics. The idea is to somewhat mirror the landscaping at Salish Crossing. He said irrigation would be installed to make sure that the new plants survive the summer heat. It was discussed that the intersection is the gateway to the Port of Edmonds, and it is important to identify it as such and make it attractive and inviting.

Mr. McChesney said the project is budgeted at \$25,000, and he anticipates the final cost will be close to that amount. The cost would be paid by the Port and not be recorded in the tenant's common area maintenance charges. Mr. McChesney recalled that the Port owns half of the property and the City owns the other half. The City used to maintain the area, but maintenance was discontinued for budgetary reasons in 2009.

### **Puget Sound Express Vessel Load/Unload Gangway Concept**

Mr. McChesney advised that staff has worked with Everett Engineering to develop conceptual designs for a gangway right off the promenade in front of the public plaza that would facilitate the loading and unloading of the Saratoga, the Puget Sound Express (PSE) whale watching vessel. He explained that the current situation is very awkward because passengers queue up by the Travelift lane and go down the Travelift dock to access the vessel. He noted that it is very difficult to address the challenges of inadequate space, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and the changing tides. He briefly presented the three conceptual design options:

- **Option 1 – Stationary Platform and Ramp.** This design would use a fabricated aluminum platform, rigidly secured to the existing promenade concrete. A 40-foot aluminum gangway would be attached to the platform with a hinged connection. A small bottom landing would be necessary to transition from the gangway to the floating dock, and the bottom of the gangway would require guides and rollers to operate smoothly when tides change. The budget estimate for fabrication alone is about \$50,000, but the option is still considered to be the

most cost-effective approach. The Commission discussed how this concept would work, and Mr. McChesney noted that some modifications would be needed in the plaza area where people would queue up.

- **Option 2 – Floating Landing with Gangway.** This option would address issues related to the tide and ADA requirements, but it would require four new pilings and permitting would be excruciating. Staff does not believe this option is practical.
- **Option 3 – Fabricated Gangway Positioned by Crane.** This option would use a crane to load the gangway onto the bow of the vessel and remove it when not in use. This option would likely cost more than \$2 million.

Mr. McChesney advised that all three options would require a Shoreline Permit. He said he does anticipate the Port would move forward with the project without a clear plan to pay for it. From staff's point of view, the existing docks are not designed to carry the heavy load of up to 100 passengers per day, and the intent was to test the idea. While it is conceptually possible to construct a gangway, there is no cheap and easy solution. He concluded that the options have been presented to PSE. If PSE expresses interest in moving the project forward, discussions about how to pay for it will begin. Assuming PSE leases the vacant parcel, one option would be for the Port to construct the gangway and amortize the cost through the lease. However, they are a long way from any type of recommendation at this point.

Ms. Kempf advised that if none of the options are determined feasible, it might be possible to construct a new, longer ramp in the location they are currently using to load.

### **Marina Side Vacant Parcel Development**

Mr. McChesney advised that the vacant parcel is across from Anthony's Restaurant and directly south of the workyard. In his opinion, it is the last piece of developable real estate on the west side of the tracks. He explained that development opportunities are limited because of the need to provide adequate parking. He provided a conceptual design of the proposed new building and explained that it was originally designed to be compatible with the Jacobsen's Marine Building. The thought was that the building might accommodate another boat dealership, but that did not occur. Recently, PSE has expressed interest in a building on the property. The building would be larger than what PSE needs, but the idea would be to sublease portions of the building out for a variety of uses.

Mr. McChesney said the Port has already obtained a Shoreline Permit for the new building. Although the Architectural Design Board's approval will expire in May of 2019, City staff has assured him that it can be extended for another year. PSE has now elected to exercise an option agreement with the Port, which allows them to move forward with due diligence. The option agreement expires in June of 2019, but PSE has the option to extend the agreement for an additional six months. The property is now considered to be "under contract." He expressed his belief that there needs to be a long-term ground lease ready to go by the end of 2019 so that a building permit application can be submitted before the Shoreline Permit expires in May of 2020. While traffic mitigation fees will likely be required, there will be no environmental mitigation requirement. He pointed out that a crosswalk would be needed in front of the building from a public safety standpoint.

For the Commission's information, Ms. Kempf reported that PSE has scheduled a season kick-off event on board the Saratoga on March 7<sup>th</sup> from 11:00 a.m. to 12 noon. They have requested the Port's support of the event and welcomed Commissioners and all Port staff on board for a quick hello, blueberry buckle, coffee and fun music. PSE requested that the Port share the event information on social media, noting that Edmonds Yacht Club members would also be invited.

Mr. McChesney summarized that he is very encouraged by where they are at now with PSE relative to the vacant property, but there is much work to be done between PSE, the architect and the contractor. In his discussions with Mr. Hanke, they also want to revisit the 5-year Service and Facilities Agreement to address concerns about the fuel discount. He anticipates the issue can be easily resolved, and PSE is committed to the Port of Edmonds.

### **Dry Storage Racks Conversion – Equipment Storage**

Mr. McChesney reviewed that the Commission and staff have previously discussed the lack of equipment storage. The large forklifts at Dry Storage are currently left out in the weather 365 days a year, and they are just not robust enough to withstand the exposure. At the next Commission meeting, staff will bring forward a proposal to purchase a new forklift, as the amount of maintenance and repair required by the Hoist forklift has become excessive. One thought is to convert a few empty slots in the dry storage racks into an equipment storage facility. The structural elements needed are already in place, and it wouldn't take a lot to convert the racks into a storage space to improve the situation. Having a place to store equipment inside will reduce maintenance and downtime. At this time, there are no cost factors to share.

Mr. McChesney shared information about the architect, NAGELsport, LLC, noting that it is a local company that has done small jobs for the Port before. It was pointed out that reducing maintenance costs for the forklifts will more than offset the revenue lost by eliminating a few of the small spaces. The project is likely two to three years from construction because other projects take priority. No Shoreline Permit will be required, so the project can be done whenever the Port has the manpower and resources to move it forward.

Mr. Menard explained that the new forklift will have a computer that should not be exposed to the weather for an extended period of time. Commissioner Preston suggested that the Port devise another way to cover the machine until the storage facility can be constructed.

Commissioner Preston suggested that the Port consider covering the entire dry storage facility, but Ms. Kempf explained that the current 30-foot height limitation makes the project unfeasible, and she does not believe that Dry Storage revenues would be adequate to recover the cost unless a third level could be added. In addition to the height limit, she questioned whether the demand is there to fill the additional space.

### **Administrative Office Remodel – Conceptual Plans**

Mr. McChesney advised that the Administrative Office Remodel is a high-priority project. The project will include remodeling the Commission room so that the dais is oriented towards the audience, adding another restroom, and remodeling the front office. The lighting and technology will be addressed as part of the update, too. However, changes to the front porch are needed before that work can start. Not only is it unattractive, there may be some rot issues that need to be addressed immediately. Mr. Menard is working on a plan to address this situation, and the intent is to start on that part of the project later in 2019 following the busy season. He anticipates the entire project will take two to three years to complete.

The Commissioners discussed the condition of the outside of the Administrative Office Building and comments were focused on ways to improve its appearance. Mr. McChesney responded that the outside of the building will be addressed after the inside work is finished.

Mr. McChesney summarized the order of priority for the facility projects as follows: The gangway project will happen when it is ready to go, and they know what it will take to move forward with the new building for PSE. The SR-104 landscape project will occur first. The Administrative Office Remodel will start to move forward in the fall, starting with the porch, then the Commission meeting room and office area, and lastly, the outside of the building. The storage shed at Dry Storage will follow the office remodel. It is anticipated that much of the Administrative Office Remodel and Dry Storage equipment shed can be done in-house, but some work may be contracted out.

Commissioner Harris questioned if it would make more sense to focus on the Dry Storage equipment shed first since there is a great need to protect the equipment and provide more storage space. Mr. McChesney agreed that is a good question, and it is important to be cognizant of all the work the maintenance staff is called upon to do. They are capable of doing the large projects in house, but they must also continue the smaller maintenance jobs. Also, any of the projects could be accelerated if outside contractors are used.

## **LONG-RANGE FACILITIES PLANNING**

### **Structured Parking Feasibility Study**

Mr. McChesney observed that parking is a recurring theme and a real riddle for the entire community, Sound Transit included. It has been discussed from time to time that the Port's northern gravel lot might be a candidate for structured parking. The Commission has included \$75,000 in the 2019 budget to do a parking feasibility study for that site. However, he is not recommending that the Port go forward with the parking feasibility study at this time. He reported that he was invited to participate on the Sound Transit Interagency Advisory Group that is also working to address parking. Rather than duplicating efforts, he would like learn from his experience on the advisory group first since there are a lot of common issues.

Mr. McChesney said he has some serious doubts about whether structured parking will work on the north parking lot, anyway, and the economics are dubious. He anticipates the cost to be \$30,000 to \$40,000 per stall, which will be difficult to recover. He gets the impression that if the Port built the structure, Sound Transit would happily lease the entire facility. The Port would make a lot of money, but a whole lot of new parking problems would be created.

Commissioner Faires asked if staff has any sense of Sound Transit's situation relative to parking at the Edmonds facility. Mr. McChesney said they are just starting the study. They know there is not enough parking, and they are trying to find suitable alternatives. A parking structure on Port property is just one of the options. However, he is concerned that while the parking structure would solve Sound Transit's parking problems, it would create more parking problems for the Port and the community as a whole.

Commissioner Faires asked if Mr. McChesney envisions that the Port and City, as minority stakeholders, could partner with Sound Transit to construct a successful parking structure in that location. Mr. McChesney observed that the lot is not very big and can currently accommodate about 130 parking stalls on the ground. The project might pencil out if it could accommodate three decks, but given the structural issues and need for internal circulation, you might just end up with the same amount of parking you have now. It was noted that the current height restriction would make it difficult to construct three levels, and the site has other constraints such as ground water hydrology and size.

Council Member Teitzel observed that Sound Transit has \$40 million to invest in addressing parking issues in Edmonds and Mukilteo. He asked if the Port has a rough estimate of what a parking structure might cost if three levels are possible. Mr. McChesney answered that he does not. However, it would be necessary to at least double the capacity that exists on the ground, which equates to 270 stalls at roughly \$30,000 each, or more than \$8 million.

### **Passenger Loading Dock for Small Cruise Ships and Excursion Vessels**

Mr. McChesney commented that, in addition to parking, capacity is another limiting factor when talking about long-range plans, economic development and tourism. He does not think the Port will ever be bigger, geographically, than it is right now, so it is important to make the available space as efficient and productive as possible. One idea would be to partner with the City to construct a passenger loading dock as an appendage to the existing fishing pier that would allow small cruise ships and excursion vessels to tie up and bring people to visit the Edmonds waterfront and downtown.

Ms. Kempf reported that American Cruise Line is now doing Puget Sound cruises, and many of the sailings are already sold out. It would make sense for Edmonds to be one of its stops, as it would be great for the community and the retailers. Mr. McChesney observed that there is not enough capacity for cruise vessels in the Port's marina, but a small passenger loading dock attached to the fishing pier would make use of an existing public facility without interrupting the current activities. Modifying the fishing pier will require a partnership with the City.

Commissioner Faires questioned if the fishing pier could withstand the sideloads needed to tie up a ship. Mr. McChesney clarified that, rather than tying the ship to the fishing pier, an independent passenger loading dock would be constructed. The ship would tie up to mooring dolphins and breast onto the loading and unloading dock that would be a floating structure. The fishing pier would not bear any of the load. The Commissioners agreed it would be worthwhile for Port staff to begin conversations with City staff to explore the concept of creating a passenger loading

dock as discussed. It would also be appropriate for Commissioner Faires to discuss the concept at an Edmonds Economic Development Commission meeting since they are always looking for good projects to advocate for.

### **Improving the Buffer Area Between Harbor Square and the Edmonds Marsh**

Commissioner Johnston recalled that a number of citizens have commented that some of the older trees in the periphery between Harbor Square and the Edmonds Marsh are failing and possibly need to be replaced. Perhaps in 2020, the Port should consider how it might improve the buffer areas for the benefit of both Harbor Square and the Edmonds Marsh. Mr. McChesney said some trees within the Port's buffer area may become hazardous at some point in the near future and other trees are not really suitable to the habitat requirements the Marsh demands. He agreed it would be appropriate to identify the trees that might need to be replaced.

### **COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS AND COMMITTEE REPORTS**

Regarding the pilot project to determine the effectiveness of alternative chemicals, Commissioner Preston observed that they already know how effective Roundup is. Perhaps it would be better to skip the Roundup for the pilot project and test another alternative instead. Commissioner Harris agreed that, if the goal is to eliminate Roundup, they should just test the alternatives. Commissioner Johnston commented that, before making a policy to eliminate Roundup altogether, they should test the alternatives to assess their relative effectiveness.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

The Commission meeting was adjourned at 1:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Angela Harris  
Port Commission Secretary