

# MINUTES

## Special Joint Meeting

### ENVIRONMENTAL BOARD & PLANNING POLICY COMMISSION

6:30 p.m. -Wednesday, March 9, 2022

Alternate Meeting Format: On March 6, 2020 the Mayor declared a civil emergency due to the outbreak of novel coronavirus (COVID-19). On March 24, 2020 the Governor issued Proclamation 20-28 relating to the COVID-19 emergency and open public meetings. The proclamation has been extended. Due to these factors, the meeting was held using a remote meeting platform.

---

#### 1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Chair Davidson.

Planning Policy Commissioners Present:

Vice Chair Voiss, Commissioners Bader, Lewis, Milligan, Monahan, and Zaragoza

Absence: Chair Faul

Environmental Board:

Chair Davidson, Vice-Chair Finch, Board Members Finch, Hintz, Lebeiko, McQuilliams, Newcomb

Absence: Board Member Bollapragada (Excused)  
Board Member Hazra (Excused)  
Board Member Madan (Unexcused)  
Board Member Wall (Excused)

Staff Present:

Minnie Dhaliwal, Director, CP&D  
Christen Leeson, Senior Planner, CP&D  
Lucy Sloman, Current Planning Manager, CP&D  
Evan Brumfield, Environmental and Regulatory Program Administrator  
Gary Schimek, Utilities Engineering Manager  
Stacy Vynne McKinstry, Sustainability Manager  
Briana Weekes, Sustainability Intern

#### 2. Public Comments (General)

- Kristi Tripple, representing Rowley Properties, 1595 Northwest Gilman Boulevard, Suite 1, Issaquah, stated that written comment had been submitted.
- Connie Marsh stated living on Squak. Brought the question what problem we are trying to solve, it looks like a future problem of harm from flooding. Marsh states having lived for many years with the city struggling with the same problem- how to toggle the switches between flood plain and stormwater section, we must understand the commitment to the city to create flood capacity on properties that don't necessarily exist. Done this through Issaquah Creek and most tributary streams, had property purchased and then create side channels with flood capacity in order to keep specific areas from flooding. Along with code language, Marsh states we need to ensure we have a plan for capital expenditures to purchase properties along with potentially parks department to allow extra flood capacity in high rain events as a major tool in this package to solve the problem from increasing damage problem. Hard to get a picture of how all of this would work together to make recommendations for what work tonight should happen because of how much can be done by creating flood capacity in other places and unsure of handling of flood way and plane. Marsh suggests to form considerations on flood way which is the highest risk and most damaging section. Narrow the focus by solving priority areas first and then move out to other areas. May take a little longer to get property damage extent. Marsh states she is tired of departments come up in silos when solutions act over departments and a variety of funding sources. Marsh suggests intertwining of plans and departments to make solutions.

Chair Davidson closed Public Comment (00:9).

#### 4. Regular Business (00:9).

##### a) Floodplain and Stormwater Code Updates (D)

*Presented by:*

*Evan Brumfield, Environmental and Regulatory Program Administrator*

*Gary Schimek, Utilities Engineering Manager*

*Paul Fendt, Parametrix (Consultant)*

Schimek addressed Marsh's comment because of the tie in, commented it was a brilliant idea. We will be coming back to these committees later this year with KC, with KC Rivers Manager to talk about exactly what you said. Issaquah Creek capital investment strategy that is already funded by the County. Please keep what Marsh talked about in mind, working with Fink in Parks as well. This is coming, separate but intertwined with this as well.

Chair Davidson opened Board Member and Commissioner clarifying questions throughout the presentation (00:20).

COMMISSIONER MILLIGAN asked if the stream flow change, but does this show a change in a capacity of those two streams, Issaquah Creek being bigger? And how do we see that?

Fendt replied capacity translates best into a flood line, what we see is the overall fullness of the stream results in a certain flow result which comes from a 100-year flow which results in a flood stage. A better way to think about the capacity of those is what is the change in flow rate translate to a change in water levels, the next thing I will talk about. The table that talks about the 100-year stage and the 500-year stage and the difference between the two, we start to see the overall capacity change when the change in flow occurs. when you look at the difference it is about a foot change and is the overall capacity as the stream continues to rise and rise. If we were to use a 500-year flood level as a surrogate for the future 100-year. What we expect in the river rise is these that are showing the difference. We would expect the streams to rise by a foot and a half or foot.

BOARD MEMBER MCQUILLIAMS asked if the flood stage is in feet and the stream flow is in CFS? Fendt that is correct.

BOARD CHAIR DAVIDSON asked about the flood stage on Issaquah Creek on the mouth at 37.3, has that ever happened? Have any of these stages previously been seen? Fendt did not know, would not surprise him if they had been seen. Schimek stated he will look on King County website and get back to you on that.

BOARD CHAIR DAVIDSON asked is this FEMA's recommendation or your recommendations you are putting forward? Fendt replied it is what we are putting forward.

Chair Davidson opened Board Member and Commissioner questions (00:35).

MCQUILLIAMS asked for clarification on that we are saying we apply a 500-year standard for future development in critical areas where we can see that kind of flooding, but use a 100-year standard for residential communities or areas with parking or types of things? Fendt replied that he wouldn't necessarily describe it as residential areas. For example, I think we have single family residences in the 500-year category and so on. It's more of the idea that do all roadways have to be elevated by the future 100 years, do all parking lots need to be there. If you are building a small facility for a park, does it need to be elevated by the 500-year. There is an intent that the 500-year surrogate be applied for the 100-year for all things that would be disrupted or damaged from flooding, if that be houses and so on or significant facilities like hospitals, schools, or major roadways. Other things that are less disrupted continue the 100-year level until the flows are updated in the models. MCQUILLIAMS asked if a cost analysis had been done on impacts. Fendt replied no.

FINCH asked how standard whatever standard that would be applied to project and if he could be walked through maybe one of the projects on the top if it was dictated to be above that standard and what would that process look like? Fendt replied that the process would be no different, if part of development proposal and part of your development or proposal is in the 100 year flood plain, it would trigger the ordinance and you would have to apply the standards in the ordinance, this has more to do with the standards that would be apply than the process it goes through. Right now, if you are building a house you would put it at the 100 year +1 foot, that would be the standard, it would be the same process and the only difference

would be that the standard would be different. The other part would be the added process if there was a resiliency review required, there would be a set of policies or standards that would be included in the review and the approaches to add a standard or make the development proposal more resilient to those floods with risk to property damage or public safety and document that has happened. Schimek added that addressed McQuilliams question that is where the cost benefit analysis is, we didn't do a global, but this gets a cost benefit analysis on a specific case. Fendt when you are doing infill or developing a site, and then a site is in a flood plain or ones in another site, the resiliency test is one pathway to address changes that are inconvenient and disruptive that really mismatches. The resiliency review gives you a way to create consistency with what is already built there and flood proof considerations.

FINCH asked if the standard applies to projects that are redevelopments? Have we gotten that far in the application of this to a different standard? Fendt the approach is the same, its just the standard might be different that gets applied. Brumfield said that there is no increase in requirements for who needs a permit or who will need to elevate, it is just purely changing the standard of elevating just one foot more. Finch asked related to that, where are we proposing going above like going to the 500-year for some types of development, is taking the one foot in addition to areas that are mapped or there other aspects where we are going above minimum requirements? Fendt the short answer is no, the one foot is to address climate change and uncertainty. Finch asked for the base requirement for FEMA or who would dictate that requirement, is that who they set or the City. Brumfield said the current requirement through FEMA is BFE+1.

MILLIGAN asked how we might manage, mitigate, and reduce impacts of increased flooding, have any of those measures we might take to reduce the impacts considered here or is this just a trajectory that we just live with? Fendt replied it is a separate thing that is not interdependent, and they are separate things. Milligan asked in the chart, the top row looks like one thing that is not like the others, why would we put hospitals and emergency management in the same column as those other uses. Fendt replied that everything right now in key facilities is based on BFE+1 which is 100-year. There is the opportunity to do more than that for key facilities. The idea is that these facilities would be harmed if they were disrupted, not that they would be damaged. There isn't any other risk built into this other than addressing climate change and uncertainty.

LEWIS asked about the BFE being +1, but asked for BFE proposal change would be +2? Brumfield that is correct. Lewis continued that on a broad spectrum rather than just the effects of water on the environment, are there more deleterious effects from flooding that aren't being addressed right now on how we protect the environment? Brumfield stated in our current flood plain code we have stipulations on hazardous materials in our flood plain, that is something we currently are addressing. Lewis asked if that would be an example of how there would be a code change effectively from making these decisions that would end up needing to be corrected as far as hazardous materials storage? Brumfield that is something we are currently doing so there wouldn't be a need for a code change. Lewis asked on others what is an example of how the code would look different from changing the current +1 to a +2, what does that look like? Brumfield said that would be in our free board requirements, which is that

base flood elevation and that +1, we increasing to two feet of free board, that would be addressed in our code. Lewis asked when we make those changes, what would the fall out be? We are going to have better protection on one hand, but how do we end up updating our facilities in another way? Brumfield said that he doesn't necessarily see the fall out, potential aesthetic concern over the buildings being at different heights or a cost increase from elevating the structure higher or having a different standard. Schimek the fall out or cost to that development project when redeveloping would either be building higher or flood proofing so that they don't have to meet that elevation for resiliency. What about existing facilities fall out for them or is it just properties that are redeveloping? Brumfield said that he doesn't think to existing buildings there would be a fallout.

Lewis questions about the fullness of flow rate when we are in a still flood stage, do we have data on what the flow has been and if we have hit similar markers in a flood stage. The inclusion of the flooding flow data points show that we should be planning towards moving toward a model of the 500-year flooding event. How many times have we been hitting those marks in the last 20 and 5 years? Schimek looking for King County's data and I will get that to you by tomorrow.

DAVIDSON asked if any other jurisdictions are looking at a 500-year event as their flood stage plus a certain amount and +2 feet. Fendt replied that he is not aware of anyone going there, inspiration for this analysis comes from executive order at end of Obama administration recommended that certain federal facilities standard be 500-year or plus +3 over the 100-year, which ever is less. Part of doing the analysis to decide what is the difference if you are choosing the 100-year plus vs the 500-year is why I went into the analysis between the difference between the two, is it not three feet it is less than that. 500 year is a decent surrogate to address climate change. Davidson replied that you didn't think the 100 year +3 is accurate, but really that is what we are talking about in Lower Issaquah Creek, thinking about BFE+2 feet if we use the 500-year standard, it is about a foot above what it is with the 100-year standard, so we are really at the 100-year standard plus three? Is that accurate? Fendt no that is double counting one of the feet. One of the feet is just to get from the 100 to the 500, and the other is for the uncertainty. It is just the BFE for the existing not changing the 100 to 500 and then doing plus. Davidson asked is the proposal you are asking us to consider using the current 100-year flood plain for house +2 or in Lower Issaquah Creek or are you talking about the 500-year flood plain +1. Can you clarify the proposal the administration is putting forward? Fendt in this chart BFE is based on existing 100-year flood and one foot is to go to 500-year, rather than just choosing one foot, we would say you would go to 500-year as the first foot and then add a foot to this. Anytime we talk about BFE we are talking about the existing 100-year. And then we talk about using the 500-year as a surrogate for the future 100-year would be. Schimek added taking the 500-year out of it, using this table, the BFE is 100-year going to the next one BFE+1 that is our current standard, what we are asking you is for critical facilities, should we go to BFE+2. We are only asking to change code for critical facilities and add that layer on? Davidson asked on people on the lower part of the chart, which is attached garages and such, are we proposing any change to them along the way? Brumfield no because the regulations are habitable, structures that are habituated by people, if they are truly just a shed, they do not have to be to BFE standard. Schimek so BFE+1 and BFE stay the same, it is just

that top column we are proposing a change to. Brumfield we are not allowed by FEMA to deregulate anything, but we can always increase protections.

NEWCOMB my question was already answered but thanks for the great work you are doing!

VOISS asked a few clarifying things. We are only talking about these different standards in areas of flooding, not houses or stores placed on hills, just parts that are in the flood plain? Brumfield replied yes. Voiss said that helps a lot because this isn't like a city-wide ordinance, where we are talking about different zones, just talking about flood plain areas when determining to use these different regulations. Mr. Schimek just mentioned, facilities, so if we are to go to BFE+2 are we talking about residential development, or are you just talking about key facilities like hospitals, police, fire, or are you also talking about residential and commercial? Schimek said yes. Voiss said I think someone alluded to it earlier, is basically backfilling would present a big cost, we are not talking about big national developers. Finally, it was alluded to it briefly as the standards change, if someone was redeveloping an area that already has been established, you would have little hills going throughout which would disturb the sightline and would get into property heights, as a City we wouldn't start establishing different sightlines, which means new development if we went to BFE+2 would start losing square footage, correct? Not only would it be aesthetic situation, lets just say Old Town, if you started developing individual lots there, you would have to be one foot up and the neighbor would be on the original plane, and they have individual heightlines, so the developer would also lose square footage and living space, correct? Schimek, it's a good point, I will have to think through all of that, that is as Joy mentioned one of the fallouts for this, but there is another reason that might hurt anyway, as Paul mentioned this is the process of application of standard for someone who redevelops, and assuming the 100-year base flood stays the same, but as we collect more data, that is going to go up. I just mentioned the work we are doing with King County, where we are evaluating the 100-year flooding, and that may go up based on better data. So we have that potential you are talking about, but you are right this could exacerbate the issue. Voiss, I appreciate it! This is one of the few negatives I see and it happens when we are developing, as some point the new standard has to set in and it starts differentiating itself from what is there already and just as long as everyone knows it because I think the difference between a foot and two feet does start affecting the decision if we want to continue with the 2080 flow or the extra foot on top of it because now you are starting to talk about two feet of back fill and larger discrepancies and that is my concern. But I do like how it is broken down as far as developments and not just having one standard, I think that is great. Schimek replied that it is a great point.

HINTZ I would be curious about the modeling for the base flow elevation and the actual large surface levels, is that primarily off of FEMA firm maps? I am hoping to learn a bit more of how accurate those maps are for topography and full extent of flood levels at certain BFEs. My understanding is that FEMA maps are cross sections at pretty big intervals, so they are pretty coarse. How confident are we feeling about the delineation of 100-year or 500-year flood plain based on the flood plain maps that we have now? Which I know get revised occasionally for certain stretches. Fendt said in a general sense, the more that something has been looked at, the general age model has more information than refines the last answer, if you were to

generally ask that question, I would suggest your updates are in better condition than most. On average of all flood maps, you are probably well above average. Schimek to add on to that, King County is going to update the 100 and 500 year, and a climate change projection on the floats, that is because of King County council thought it was important for that to happen on Issaquah Creek after the last 2020, they put that into the budget to ask the question you are asking Dan, if we are all comfortable with the maps that were done in in 2020 but with some of the data it takes a long time to get those maps, the data probably came from 2018. They invested in Issaquah Creek to get that uncertainty even better.

ZARAGOZA do these higher standards lower insurance costs and premiums since these new buildings would be that much safer? Brumfield said I think I got your question, are you asking will residents or businesses see a greater discount in insurance? Zaragoza replied yes will there be any impact with the greater standards. Brumfield replied yes, so currently we have a 25% rate discount for our residents through CFRS program and if we have a greater PFRE going from a 1 to a 2 you get more points which would potentially rank us up and give us potentially 5% more discount. So, we could go from 25 to 30, but there are more factors than just a 1 foot BFE but getting us more points heading towards that route.

FINCH asked because there was quick mention of when something is not mapped there is an extra foot, the table we are looking at the mapped or the unmapped? Fendt replied these are the mapped areas, the ordinance has to be triggered and that would have to be development in the mapped areas. Finch asked so if plus one for unmapped would be in addition. Fendt replied that there is not a standard for unmapped areas. Schimek replied When information is available for detailed studies, it is BEF+1 . Finch asked how much of the city where development would be occurring is mapped versus unmapped. Brumfield replied that we don't currently have that information. Issaquah Creek and Tibbetts are all detailed mapped. Schimek replied that for the next round they will add Issaquah Creek and Tibbetts to the graphic.

DAVIDSON ended the questions and asked for comments from PPC or Environmental Board.

MCQUILLIAMS thanked staff for the thoughtful study. Agrees with key facilities being at BEF+2. Would like staff to think about residential and if there is an impact to homeowners that want to remodel their home. Concerned about the cost to them.

FISHER thanked staff for the presentation. Encourages staff to complete a GIS overlap of what is versus what would be. Would be a good tool to have. Reiterated MCQUILLIAMS comments.

VOISS echoed previous comments. Likes breakdown of developments and likes resiliency , a little bit of tradeoff. Need to consider differences in developments such as parking lot versus storage versus school, especially as put more infrastructure into Central Issaquah area. Agree regarding residential to consider hardships as well as aesthetic view of neighborhood in floodplain. Most of those are established and there won't be a lot of additional development in the floodplain. Schools, hospitals, not concerned we'll be building too many more in the floodplain. Residential is main concern and would keep at BEF +1

MILLIGAN gives a plus 1 to comments from McQuilliams and Fisher. Key facilities, hospitals and such, saw in a column further to the right that assisted living was bundled in with another group. Need to not only consider resiliency, but also recovery after a flood. One of the more important things that needs to occur, even when there is a flood, are the most vulnerable trapped populations. We aren't including schools as we would hope that for a flood event we might be able to prevent gathering at a school. It is a variable- you can go to school or not go to school. If you live in assisted living, you are kind of trapped there. So wants us to consider assisted living with hospitals and other key facilities as being the ones that are most in need of the higher standard. And, we are going to talk about it, in the next section about CRS insurance, agreeing with the speakers before me about not wanting to put a burden on the single family residence, but I do want to balance that with the benefit that we want to provide to them in the cost of their insurance. Not only does that speak to general cost but also housing affordability.

ZARAGOZA would like to mirror the other commentators on using the 500 surrogate for 100 years until that data comes in. also likes the variables of +1 or +2 based on the resiliency. Thinks that makes a lot of sense. And wanted to mirror the comment on the assisted living facilities.

NEWCOMB wanted to suggest that for single family residences of separating remodel from new construction. Keep new construction in BEF +2, but if doing remodel, not make them raise things up another foot. Believe it is very great that you'll be using data and things that King County is working on now. Will help save money and time. Thank you for thinking about climate change and looking into the future.

FINCH thinks it would be helpful to recognize mapped and unmapped. We should probably spend the most time on the 500 year, 100 year on the mapped areas. We've used 500 as the best projection of what that could look like. Would be interesting to compare that logic with the BEF +2 unmapped and the BEF +1 to see where they align. Support the way staff are approaching but need to clearly state impacts and where apply.

LEWIS agrees the BEF +2 and that it is necessary based on the data. Also wants to point out the difference of facility types and the resiliency - we need to consider the use and not just the structure. Would give the opposite point for the schools in terms of where would we put people in the event of a disaster and it is often a school. So we want to make sure we shore up those events. What does it mean to have more backfill in a community when we require it only on new development and not remodel. What will be the impact of having different backfill in the community? Will it make neighbors more vulnerable? Would like to hear more on real world implications - what are we proposing and why in order to be able to see if we are creating greater harm. Height standards- do we need to revise our code? These are important things for us to address before making a blanket decision but right now. Supports BEF +2.

DAVIDSON requested to keep comments short.

HINTZ requested that we separate out parks related facilities, trails, bridges. Need to make sure if infrastructure is going in, even if considered low impact, risk, don't want to see armoring going in to protect infrastructure. Bridges especially. Would like to have considered further or if there is some nuance to the facilities.

DAVIDSON encouraged the City to speak with the City Attorney about new standard. If not other jurisdiction has BEF +2 to make sure we have ducks in a row if someone is coming in with a major redevelopment and have a basis for why we are doing it.

MILLIGAN Commissioner Lewis changed mind about schools.

DAVIDSON encouraged everyone to work together to get through the agenda.

FENDT presented on Future Stormwater Standards and the recommendation to wait for King County's analysis.

DAVIDSON invited comments and questions. None.

FENDT presented on the third element, Critical Drainage Review.

DAVIDSON asked who would do the critical drainage review and what is the standard by which the city would require it when is it triggered. Fendt answered that it would be an add on to the stormwater review and it would be done by the applicant. Davidson asked if you were a house located in a floodplain or stormwater area, would they be required to do it or could they rely on a nearby commercial building that just did it. Fendt replied that if there was a similar study that relied on the same potential risks, they could use that study but doesn't think it would come up often. Davidson asked what is the benefit that comes to the city by requiring this review. Schimek replied that this is a resiliency piece. No matter what you choose at your design level there is always potential for a bigger storm. This is a way to address that. Potential failure after it has been built. For the review slide, this would apply more to commercial applications. Brumfield replied that this drainage review slide would be for structures that would be impacted. We are putting this forward until we wait for King County to finish their precipitation modeling. We can get more localized drainage review for projects instead of a blanket detention requirement. Davidson asked if the end result is to get right sized as best can for detention facilities for redevelopment and new development.

MILLIGAN asked about the critical drainage review slide and whether there are any 5As. Fendt replied that Step 4 is what sends it to the impact analysis or not. If you have one of these and it looks like it would take a 1000 year flood to cause this, would provide in documentation and any resiliency that would be necessary. If high frequency and magnitude, goes to 5s.

FINCH asked if the critical drainage review is a temporary measure and would stop being used after the King County data is available. Brumfield replied that is something we'd decide once the King County data comes out. We aren't planning for it to be temporary, but we could if the data comes out. Schimek added that we are looking for things that could cause a major issue during catastrophic events, it is something we might want to keep on forever or it might go

away when we get better data. Brumfield added that we will be updating our standards every five years as the stormwater manual comes out. We will have to amend our code and update our standards. Every five years we will have a complete review of our code and where we can be improving.

MCQUILLIAMS asked about the NPDES permit and the requirement to update their standards. Ecology says that we must do it this year. Brumfield replied that we also use Ecology standards, but we hope to get the rainfall data in 1-2 years that we can use for our detention requirements. We will adopt this code by June 30, 2022. We are trying to discuss tonight where we are going above and beyond permit requirements, but no the King County data does not affect the current deadline.

LEWIS echoed that it is reasonable to wait for new standards from King County, but it would be a good work item in the next two years while we are waiting to create a framework for ideals so we compare apples to apples so we can see how closely our standards align with the County. For critical drainage review think the approach is well laid out and think the analysis where we are failing with review and so we can see where we want to go above and beyond.

FINCH generally supports direction that staff is taking. Would like to better understand costs and timelines associated with critical drainage reviews. It would help put this in context for anyone looking to go through this process.

DAVIDSON confirmed that no further feedback and thanked the staff, Board and Commission. Davidson invited PPC to stay on for the next meeting but excused those that wanted to leave. (All commissioners except LEWIS left the meeting.)

Approximately 8:15

-----

**b) Neighborhood Meetings and Checklist (D)**

*Presented by:*

*Lucy Sloman, Planning Manager*

*Minnie Dhaliwal, Director of Community Planning & Development*

DAVIDSON introduced Lucy Sloman and Director Dhaliwal.

Sloman presented on the Neighborhood Checklist and reviewed the Environmental Neighborhood Meeting presentation provided to Environmental Board on August 11, 2021. Sloman presented options for revising the checklist for future use that would address the feedback provided by the Environmental Board in summer of 2021. Sloman presented potential aggregate topics that could be presented to the Environmental Board in a higher level synthesis, compared to individual project checklists.

Environmental Board members provided feedback that they'd like to see a high level synthesis. Commissioner LEWIS provided comments as she participated in the development

of the Board and Checklist. She encouraged the Board to make sure they retain the information in some way and continue building of the checklist at this point in the process compared to reforming the checklist. It is important to enhance and encourage community engagement as part of the checklist process.

Board suggested that we ensure that all critical areas are covered. We also want to make sure we get information on projects that don't go through CPD, look at holistically.

Want to make sure we aren't losing access to data.

CPD will keep the current data collection we have for 2022 (checklist). Once critical area ordinance is updated, we will incorporate. Going forward, we will also provide some synthesis of accumulated data for this year. Also, we will need to consider enhancement and other city program data into the reporting we can work on synthesizing data, but we will also keep the checklist the same for this year. We will have both a qualitative and quantitative information presented to the Board.

Vynne McKinstry provided updates to the Board. Noted the updated Board calendar at the end of the packet. There are no updates on in person meetings. Board members requested that we have a chance to vote on whether to return in person. Acknowledged the work of Briana Weekes, Sustainability Intern, who is leaving the city.

The Environmental Board authorized Vynne McKinstry to provide a summary of Title 18 comments to date in a memo format to City Council.

Finch provided an update on the Community Capital Finance Taskforce. Finch and one other member of the Taskforce presented recommendations to City Council on Monday night. Recommendations were accepted by City Council, meaning they will take into consideration going forward. We will want to consider how any revenue tools might be relevant to goals of the Environmental Board or ICAP implementation. Recommendations are available in the Council packet.

DAVIDSON ended the meeting at 8:46 and reminded Board members about the next meeting on March 10.

