

PORT COMMISSION OF THE PORT OF EDMONDS
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

August 31, 2009

Commissioners Present

Bruce Faires, President
Mary Lou Block, Vice President
Marianne Burkhart, Secretary
Fred Gouge
Jim Orvis

Staff Present

Bob McChesney, Executive Director
Tina Drennan, Finance Manager

Others Present

Bradford Cattle, Port Attorney
Karin Noyes, Recorder

CALL TO ORDER

Commission President Faires called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

CONSENT AGENDA

The Commission pulled Item A (Approval of Agenda) from the consent agenda.

COMMISSIONER BURKHART MOVED THAT THE REMAINDER OF THE CONSENT AGENDA BE APPROVED TO INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS:

- B. APPROVAL OF AUGUST 10, 2009 COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES.**
- C. APPROVAL OF JULY ELECTRONIC TRANSFERS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$904,135.29.**
- D. APPROVAL OF VOIDED CHECK NUMBER 67958 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$79.47.**
- E. APPROVAL OF CHECK NUMBERS 68348 THROUGH 68375 INCLUDING DIRECT DEPOSITS D00480 THROUGH D00490 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$4,925.68 FOR PAYROLL.**
- F. APPROVAL OF CHECK NUMBERS 68376 THROUGH 68377 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$328.60 FOR PAYROLL.**
- G. APPROVAL OF CHECK NUMBERS 68378 THROUGH 68427 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$249,823.30 FOR HARBOR SQUARE ACCOUNTS PAYABLE.**

- H. APPROVAL OF CHECK NUMBERS 11020 THROUGH 11036 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$83,823.30 FOR HARBOR SQUARE ACCOUNTS PAYABLE.**
- I. AUTHORIZATION FOR EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO WRITE OFF \$6,291.11 AND SEND ACCOUNT TO COLLECTIONS.**
- J. AUTHORIZATION FOR EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO WRITE OFF \$1,595.60 AND SEND ACCOUNT TO COLLECTIONS.**

COMMISSIONER GOUGE SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY, WITH COMMISSIONER ORVIS ABSTAINING FROM VOTING ON ITEM B.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA (Item A on the Consent Agenda)

COMMISSIONER BURKHART MOVED THE COMMISSION MODIFY THE AGENDA BY ADDING A DISCUSSION OF THE ANTHONY'S ROOF PROJECT AS ITEM 6B. COMMISSIONER ORVIS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Note: Because the representative from the Emergency Services Coordinating Agency had not arrived at the meeting, the agenda was further changed to place her presentation later on the agenda.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

No one in the audience expressed a desire to address the Commission during this portion of the meeting.

COMMISSION MEETING SCHEDULE

Mr. McChesney observed that over the next few months the Commission would spend a great deal of time discussing operating budget issues. He referred to the proposed schedule and invited them to provide additional input. He specifically noted that the September 14th agenda would include a discussion regarding economic development and the property tax levy.

Commissioner Gouge inquired when the consultants would provide an update regarding the Harbor Square Master Plan. Mr. McChesney suggested the consultants (LMN Architects and Burke Associates) be invited to provide a presentation to the Commission on September 28th. He reminded them that the Property Committee and staff have been working with the consultants to complete the plan. The plan is currently in draft format as a work in progress, and much of what is contained in the document would be considered privileged and protected. Mr. Cattle concurred.

NORTH KING AND SOUTH SNOHOMISH COUNTY REGIONAL MITIGATION PLAN FOR NATURAL HAZARDS

Mr. McChesney introduced Jamie Gravelle, Emergency Coordinator, Emergency Services Coordinating Agency (ESCA), who has been very helpful to the Port in updating the Port's portion of the regional mitigation plan.

Ms. Gravelle explained that ESCA is the coordinating agency for the regional plan which involves cities, towns and special purpose districts in North King and South Snohomish County. The original mitigation plan was adopted in 2004, and she has worked with staff to incorporate changes and updates for re-submittal, which is required by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) every five years. The program is funded by an interlocal agreement amongst the cities, as well as grant funding. In addition, grant funding would be available in the event of a disaster as long as a qualified and viable management plan is on record. She referred to the draft update, which identifies the

programs that have been accomplished by the Port in the recent past, as well as those that are in the Port's plan to move forward in the next five years.

Commissioner Burkhart referred to the table titled, "Estimated Value of Structures and Equipment at Risk," and inquired if the numbers were updated based on the Consumer Price Index (CPI) or if the Port completed the study they had originally intended to do. Ms. Drennan advised that the numbers were adjusted based on CPI.

Commissioner Orvis observed that two sling boat launchers were missing from the inventory. Ms. Drennan advised the two launchers were included as part of the dry storage area. Mr. McChesney indicated that the launchers would be added to the plan, and he emphasized that the plan can be modified at any time to account for new facilities or developments that might take place in the next few years, such as the Harbor Square Master Plan. Omissions can also be added at any time. He explained that the plan is required by FEMA. If the Port does not have a plan in place, they would not qualify for FEMA funding in the event of a disaster. Ms. Gravelle added that the purpose of the review is to obtain feedback from the Commission, and their recommendations would be incorporated into the document before it is forwarded to the State and FEMA for review and comment. A final document would be presented to the Commission for formal adoption in early 2010.

Ms. Gravelle explained that the mitigation plan lays out the things each jurisdiction does on a routine basis and what they plan to do as funding and staff time becomes available. It is not a promise or contract that requires the Port to take specific action. Instead, it is a proactive approach to continue to fix things before they are broken to minimize potential damage.

Commissioner Faires requested clarification of the table that identifies the Port's rating for each of the potential natural hazards. Ms. Gravelle explained that the rating system came from the State, and the Commissioners should feel free to identify any discrepancies. She briefly explained how the rating system works, noting that those hazards that are least likely to occur have a lower rating, even though the damage and threat to life could be significant.

Commissioner Orvis suggested the proposed flood rating be reconsidered. He suggested that what is currently considered the "100-year storm" is more likely to be a 10 or 5-year occurrence, and he doesn't foresee the City would do anything to correct the situation in the near future. Mr. McChesney agreed to make the appropriate adjustment.

COMMISSIONER BURKHART MOVED THE COMMISSION GIVE APPROVAL TO SUBMIT THE NORTH KING AND SOUTH SNOHOMISH REGIONAL MITIGATION PLAN (FOR NATURAL HAZARDS) TO THE STATE AND FEMA FOR REVIEW AS COORDINATED WITH THE EMERGENCY SERVICES COORDINATING AGENCY, WITH MODIFICATIONS AS APPROVED BY THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR. COMMISSION GOUGE SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ANTHONY'S ROOF PROJECT

Mr. McChesney reported that upon further review, Anthony's has decided to move forward with the roofing project this fall rather than waiting for the spring as they tentatively asked to do. He advised that staff met with representatives from Anthony's on August 19th, where it was reported that Anthony's has hired an architect to develop the project specifications. Staff proposed a bid schedule that anticipates the contractor would be approved by the Commission on October 12th, and the contract would be awarded the next day. He reminded Anthony's of the very narrow construction window, and staff intends to work closely with them to meet their scheduling needs.

Mr. McChesney advised that the current issue in defining the contract scope is determining which costs the Port is responsible to pay and which costs would be paid by Anthony's. He recalled that the lease agreement states the Port would pay for 50% of the project. While Anthony's has proposed some concepts that stretch the definition of "roof," staff intends to take a very narrow view of the situation. The shared project costs would include such things as the

membrane and other elements of the roof system; it would not include duct work, electrical, plumbing, etc. He said he has asked for a detailed sketch of the various costs associated with the project so both parties can agree upon the various items ahead of time.

Mr. McChesney further advised that decisions must still be made as to the contract procedure, itself. He recalled that as of April 2009, Anthony's had agreed to complete the plans and specifications, and the Port would be responsible for preparing the bid documents and bidding the project as a public works project under the auspice of the Port. They are currently working to refine the process to give Anthony's as much benefit as possible. He noted that Anthony's is hesitant to subscribe to the public works bidding process because they would be unable to choose their own contractor, they would be unable to negotiate costs, and they would have no way to control the quality. Commissioner Burkhart observed that Anthony's has known of this requirement for several years.

Mr. McChesney reported that the Port just received the project specifications, and staff will put together the contract documents as soon as possible. However, keeping the costs segregated within the body of a single contract would be difficult. He said he would like to avoid a situation where the Port pays all the costs and then negotiates reimbursement from Anthony's after the fact. He suggested one solution would be to bid out the whole project, including the items that Anthony's would be exclusively responsible for, and include a signed addendum that obligates them to pay for the additional items. Another option would be to itemize everything into a contract that binds all three parties (contractor, Port and Anthony's).

Commissioner Orvis inquired if it would be possible to break out the major items into one bid and then the additional costs could be portioned out to the Port and Anthony's. Mr. McChesney agreed that would be possible, but there would still be an issue about who actually owns the contract. Commissioner Faires suggested perhaps they could go one step further in the Request for Proposals to group the statements into two categories, those that are shared costs and those that are the exclusive responsibility of Anthony's. The project could be bid as a single-contract, but the payment could be separated.

Mr. Cattle explained that one option would be for the Port to undertake the project as a purely public works (prevailing wage) approach. He expressed his belief that it would not be possible to avoid the requirement of bidding the project as a public works project that requires prevailing wages. He suggested they prepare a contract that specifies the various elements of the project. The contract could simply obligate Anthony's to pay the Port for those items they are responsible for as the work is completed. The Port would own the contract, and the entire project would be bid as a public works project. He emphasized that this is really the only approach available to the Port if Anthony's doesn't want to be the project manager. If Anthony's were to take the lead on the project, he suggested the cost savings could be substantial.

Commissioner Faires reminded the Commission that Anthony's is a long-time tenant. Regardless of the approach, he does not see the situation as posing a significant risk to the Port. Commissioner Block recalled that the Port previously offered to let Anthony's take the lead on the project, but they declined. Commissioner noted that their decision was made based on the idea that they could avoid the prevailing wage requirements. The Commission agreed they would be comfortable with either approach.

Mr. Cattle left the meeting at 7:34 p.m.

COST RECOVERY PROGRAM

Ms. Drennan reminded the Commission that the cost recovery program was first implemented at the Port of Edmonds after the marina was rebuilt. It was established as a method of determining wet moorage rates based on the costs of operating the marina. She advised that the costs of operating the marina consist of operating costs and capital costs. She briefly described the method staff used to calculate annual capital and operating costs, which are then distributed to the cost centers based on the usage of the asset. She explained that wet moorage costs are allocated based on both

slip cost (cost of renting a slip regardless of the size of the vessel) and area cost (costs that are driven by how large the space is).

The Commission and staff briefly reviewed the various documents included in the Commission's packet as follows:

- Ms. Drennan referred to Page 7, which summarizes the capital and operating costs and allocates overhead to the cost centers based on estimated usage. She noted that bond interest payments were added into the costs, and interest income from investments reduced the total costs.
- Ms. Drennan referred to Page 8, which shows the number of slips, total square footage of all the slips, and the total revenue required to cover the costs of operating the marina. She noted that the slip costs are divided by the total number of slips in the marina to determine the fixed cost associated with each slip. The area costs are allocated to each slip based on square footage. The revenue required for area costs is reduced by overhang revenues and increased by an estimated vacancy rate of 1%.
- Ms. Drennan advised that Pages 9 and 10 show the slip sizes, number of slips in each size, the square footage of each size, fixed and variable cost allocations per slip size, the total rate per slip, and the annual income for each slip size.
- Ms. Drennan referred to Pages 11 and 12, which show the difference between the 2009 actual rate and the rates per the formula. She said one flaw of the cost recovery program is that it does not take the market rates into account and marinas cannot keep their tenants if they increase their rates significantly every year. For example, in 2002 the Commission believed the Port had reached market in the 28-foot and under categories, and they did not increase the rates for those slip sizes. In 2003 the rates were increased by what the Commission felt the market would support, and in 2004 the rates were raised based on CPI. There was no rate increase in 2005, and in 2006 the rates were raised by 4% for smaller slips and 5% for larger slips. In 2007 and 2008 the Port raised moorage rates by approximately CPI plus 1%. Moorage rates were raised 4% in 2009.

Commissioner Faires asked staff to review how the Commission arrived at the current rate for covered moorage. Ms. Drennan recalled that, over time, a decision was made that a certain multiplier would be used for specific sizes of slips. Commissioner Faires recalled that this was to make up for the fact that more capital assets are tied up in the larger slips. Ms. Drennan clarified that the additional capital costs associated with the covered moorage are minimal, and the multiplier was actually based on market demand rather than actual capital costs. Commissioner Orvis observed that political conditions do not allow marinas to construct new covered moorage, and this increases the market value of the Port's covered spaces. Commissioner Faires summarized that the current rate for covered moorage includes more factors than those related to operating costs and capital replacement. Commissioner Gouge recalled that several years ago, the Finance Committee identified a market value for the covered moorage spaces and recommended the rates be increased based on a specific multiplier.

- Ms. Drennan advised that Pages 13 and 14 show comparisons of the Port of Edmonds moorage rates to the rates of other marinas in the area. The differences are difficult to quantify because many marinas do not list slip widths, as well as length. In most cases, however, the Port is very close to the rates charged by other marinas.

Commissioner Faires suggested that if the quality of the marina were factored in, the Port's rates are very reasonable. Ms. Drennan noted that, with the exception of Everett's 12th Street Marina and Shilshole, The Port of Edmonds is one of the newest marinas. She added that covered moorage is more difficult to find and the Port is higher than most other marinas in this category.

- Ms. Drennan referred to Pages 15, 16, and 17, which show the rate increases for the past 10 years by percentage of increase, by dollar amount of the increase, and by slip size. Page 18 shows the effect of the rate increases on revenue. She noted that prior to 2002, the smaller slips were carrying the majority of the rate increases, but these

categories currently have the weakest waitlists. Some large increases were implemented in 2003 to bring the rates closer to market value.

Commissioner Faires inquired if principle and interest expenses are included as part of operating expenses. Ms. Drennan answered these expenses are not classified as operating items. Commissioner Faires pointed out that the Port's goal is to put money in the bank for future capital expenditures and to improve their bonding capacity. Commissioner Orvis recalled that the Commission discussed this issue a few years ago and decided it was incorrect to advertise a cost recovery program that reserved money for future capital replacement. The money they are setting aside as part of the cost recovery program is being used to pay the principal and interest associated with the current bonds. Once the tenants had a clear understanding of the Port's goal, there have been fewer complaints associated with rate increases. Ms. Drennan agreed the Port is not actually putting money aside for future capital replacement. Commissioner Gouge summarized that the Port's goal is to pay down the bond debt. Commissioner Faires added that as the Port pays down their debt, they improve their ability to issue new bonds for future capital replacement.

Mr. McChesney recalled his experience at Port Angeles where the rates did not generate sufficient revenue for the landlord to put money back into the facility. A result, the facility started on a downward cycle, and it has been hard to catch up. They had to start from scratch and debt service on the bonds had to be paid by the moorage tenants through significant rate increases. He summarized there are many marinas in Puget Sound that are not well kept for this same reason.

Commissioner Faires recalled that cost recovery was put in place as a tool to ensure the Port was looking at capital replacement. About 15 years ago, most public marinas were not looking at anything but maintenance costs in terms of moorage rates. It is important to consider both operating and capital opportunities, and the cost recovery program has enabled the Port to do this. As a result of the program, the Port will be in a better place in the future. Commissioner Gouge agreed and commended staff to preparing documents that are easy to understand.

Council Member Wambolt inquired if the Port conducts a cost recovery review every year. Ms. Drennan answered that the Port only conducts a detailed review of their cost recovery program every five years, but they do consider the cost recovery formula as part of each year's budget review.

Ms. Drennan advised that she is in the process of preparing the draft operating budget for the Finance Committee's review on September 28th. The document would be presented to the Commission for review on October 12th.

STAFFING LEVELS AND COSTS

Ms. Drennan reviewed that over the past five years, the Port has added one full-time equivalent (FTE) Harbor Square Maintenance Worker Lead, a .5 FTE Harbor Square Janitorial Worker, 1 FTE Travelift Operator and a .5 FTE Operations Seasonal Staff. In 2007, the .5 FTE Janitorial Worker was replaced by 1 FTE Maintenance Worker II. In 2008, the Port added a .5 FTE Seasonal Landscape Assistant and a .5 FTE Operations Seasonal Staff. In 2009, the Port reduced staffing by .5 FTE Landscaping Assistant and 1.32 Operations Seasonal Staff and added 1 FTE Operations Assistant and 1 FTE Operations Staff I.

As a government agency, Ms. Drennan advised that the Port of Edmonds participates in the Public Employees Retirement System (PERS), and both the Port and its employees contribute. In 2001-2003 the PERS rates were dropped too low, and they began to climb in 2005. The rates from 2006-2009 were 3.69%, 6.13%, 8.31% and 5.29% respectively. While the 2010 rate is not yet available, projections for the next five years indicate it will be substantial.

Ms. Drennan reported that the Port pays employee and family medical premiums for the Uniform Medical Plan. She recalled that in the late 1990's and early 2000's, medical premiums were increasing by 15% or more each year, but these **increases** have dropped to more reasonable levels. Commissioner Faires inquired regarding the staff's reaction to

the Commission's earlier decision to **fully fund only** the uniform medical plan. Ms. Drennan explained that when this decision was made, it was based on a different program. Employees looked at the difference between the premium and co pay. Unless a person planned on maximizing their co pay and deductible, the uniform plan would be the best option. She found the uniform plan preferable over the health maintenance organization plan because it allowed her to go to any doctor. Because the State program anticipates increases to the deductible amounts, there may be some dissatisfaction amongst the employees. However, she summarized there is no need to change the basis of the plan at this point.

Ms. Drennan explained that Labor and Industries taxes are based on the type of work an employee is engaged in as well as the Port's experience factor (determined by the number and amount of the most recent three years of claims). She noted that in 2007 and 2008 there were three injuries to Port staff that resulted in time loss from work as well as indemnity payments because of permanent loss of range of motion. This increased the Port's rate in 2009 and staff expects the rate would continue to increase through 2011.

Ms. Drennan further explained that the Port's Employment Security Fund payments have decreased over the past four years, but the 2010 rate is not yet available.

Mr. McChesney summarized that overhead, salaries, benefits, etc. are all tied together. It will be important during the upcoming budget process to come up with a good strategy for managing the costs and being as efficient as possible.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR COMMENTS

Mr. McChesney reported that bid opening for the Harbor Square Landscape Maintenance contract is scheduled for September 8th. The Landscape Specialist has developed an elaborate and detailed specification, and they are curious to find out if it actually increases the costs or if it is so clear and precise it reduces the risk and they get a better contract. Several contractors attended the walk through and expressed an interest in the contract. If the bids do not match the budget, they may have to modify the scope of work and rebid the project as a request for proposals as opposed to a contract. Staff would report to the Commission at their next meeting.

Mr. McChesney advised that marketing Harbor Square is still excruciatingly slow. They received one proposal from a veterinary specialist who wanted to be in Building 2. Staff did not think it would be a good fit, and they offered space in Buildings 4 and 5 instead. The offer was turned down. A small space was leased to a certified public accountant, and Maverick Labels has asked for an additional 1,300 square feet of space. At this time, they are at approximately 68% occupancy. Their goal is to remain competitive in the market without compromising their rate structure.

Mr. McChesney said staff has been researching options for replacing the work truck, and they would present their recommendation to the Commission on September 14th.

The Washington Public Port Association (WPPA) Economic Development Seminar is scheduled for September 17th and 18th, and the WPPA Environmental Seminar is scheduled for October 1st and 2nd. He noted Commissioner Block would attend the Environmental Seminar. The Pacific Coast Congress (PCC) Conference is scheduled for October 6th through 9th, and Mr. Yeager and Mr. Danberg typically attend this event. The Small Ports Conference is scheduled for October 22nd and 23rd, and Commissioner Orvis plans to attend. Commissioner Orvis would also attend the Marina Conference on November 3rd and 4th. The annual WPPA meeting is scheduled for November 18th.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS AND COMMITTEE REPORTS

Commissioner Gouge reported on his attendance at the Edmonds City Council's September 22nd meeting where they adopted a moratorium on tree cutting in Edmonds until a new street tree plan is done. Council Member Wambolt

said the situation could change quickly since the City's Arborist recently reminded the Mayor that the trees are rotten. The Mayor has hired an independent arborist, and if the new report corroborates the City's Arborist's report, the trees would be removed. Commissioner Gouge reported that a representative from the United States Census Bureau provided a presentation to the City Council regarding the census project. He emphasized the importance of providing accurate information, which would have an impact on school funding, etc. He said he plans to attend the September 29th City Council Meeting, where the Edmonds Yacht Club is scheduled to present their proposal for additional height to accommodate the lighthouse feature on their new building.

Commissioner Block reported that she attended Jacque Mayo's memorial service earlier in the day.

Commissioner Orvis announced that the South Snohomish County Cities Dinner Meeting is scheduled for September 24th, and Commissioner Gouge and Mr. McChesney have indicated they would be in attendance. Bob Druwell is scheduled to speak about things that are important to the south part of the County and most of the cities will want to speak about REET funding, keeping Boeing, economic development, etc.

Commissioner Orvis announced his plan to attend the WPPA Small Ports Conference, the Marina Conference and the WPPA Annual Meeting. He indicated he would not be present at the October 12th meeting.

Commissioner Burkhart reported that she attended the monthly Ferry Partnership Meeting in Kingston. She also attended the Edmonds Citizens Economic Development Commission Meeting. Both groups are progressing slowly through their agendas. The Ferry Partnership has divided into two groups to work on future agendas, and they have agreed to add additional meeting dates if necessary.

Commissioner Burkhart reported that she attended the October 17th Woodway Town Council Meeting and delivered a copy of the Port's budget meeting dates. They assigned people to the different committees, but they did not assign a liaison to attend Port Commission meetings. She reported that she also attended the Woodway Town Fair, which was nice and likely paid for by various vendors. She encouraged the Commissioners to attend the event next year and consider the possibility of having a similar event at the Port of Edmonds. She said it was also reported that the voters approved more operating money for the City, but they did not approve the proposed purchase of Rosary Heights.

Commissioner Faires reported that the Edmonds Yacht Club (EYC) is continuing their pursuit of the unique lighthouse feature for their new building. It has come to their attention that in order for the City Council to approve their request for additional height, a Comprehensive Plan amendment would be required. The Comprehensive Plan is always a work in progress, and there is a process for making amendments to the document. He expressed his belief that it is not likely the City Council would approve the exception to the amendment process to expedite the change. He suggested the City Council could either decide to do nothing with the EYC's request, or they could place the request in the normal process for Comprehensive Plan changes. The EYC's development would allow them to implement the change at a later date by lifting the roof to accommodate the higher lighthouse feature. He expressed his belief that the Port should support the EYC's effort to change the Comprehensive Plan. The Port's waterfront properties could be significantly impacted if the proposed provision is allowed, and it would be within the Port's best interest to pursue the request.

Commissioner Faires pointed out that some City Council Members have gone on record stating that they would never support a height change as requested by the EYC. He questioned if they would be required to recuse themselves from participating in the final decision. Council Member Wambolt clarified that the EYC has asked for an amendment to the 2009 Comprehensive Plan, but the deadline for submitting amendments was months ago. They are now asking the City Council to consider an exception to the deadline. He said he anticipates the City Council would deny their request and recommend they submit an amendment for the 2010 update that won't be approved until late 2010. The City Attorney would provide direction on the issue of whether or not certain City Council Members would be required to recuse themselves from participating in the decision.

Commissioner Faires reported that he attended the Edmonds Citizens Economic Development Commission's second meeting on August 13th, where he was encouraged in several ways. There was a lot of miscellaneous discussion, but they were able to approve vision and mission statements. There was also consensus that the solution must quantitatively address the economic short fall the City is currently faced with. The group was also interested in making a serious effort to encourage the City Council to implement their recommendations rather than leaving them on the shelf like so many other economic development plans. The next meeting is scheduled for September 16th, when they plan to discuss their goals for accomplishing the mission statement.

Commissioner Orvis referred to the article that was published in the local paper regarding the progress of the Edmonds Citizens Economic Development Commission. He expressed concern that the group still does not have momentum. Commissioner Faires suggested that some members of the Commission would eventually force the group forward to address the issues, but it is also important to allow some time at the beginning of the process for people to just talk about their concerns. City Council Member Wambolt expressed his belief that the Commission is made up of smart people who will get results from their efforts. The group referenced earlier economic development studies, and they are interested in learning why nothing was ever implemented. He said he is confident the group will come up with a realistic and viable plan, and they will push it forward to implementation.

Commissioner Block reported that she received a letter from the Mayor of Shoreline to Snohomish County objecting to the County's proposal that Point Wells be rezoned to an urban center designation. The letter contains good rationale and was well written. She agreed to provide a copy of the letter to the Port staff and suggested it is in the Port's best interest to stay apprized of what is taking place with regard to Point Wells.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Respectfully submitted,

Marianne Burkhart
Port Commission Secretary