Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
1. Placeholder for discussion of transportation issues not specifically listed below. (Hinman)	Staff Comment/Recommendation 11/10: Specific transportation-related issues are below. This issue is in the matrix as a placeholder for a general discussion of transportation issues related to the Bear Creek Neighborhood Plan update. Public Comment 11/17: Steve Thompson of the Bear Creek CAC submitted written testimony addressing: 1) the likelihood that congestion would continue to be a problem in the Avondale corridor as long as development continues on Redmond Ridge and there are not other transportation options; 2) the functionality and desirability of U-turns in the Avondale corridor; and 3) the intent of policy #28 (see details in issue 4 below) PC Comments The Commission covered specific transportation questions as described below.	Opened 10/27 Closed 11/17
2. What is the relationship between this plan update and the Greater Southeast Redmond Area Transportation Study? (Biethan) What is the City doing to address transportation issues in the Avondale corridor? (Biethan)	Staff Comment/Recommendation 11/10: The Greater Southeast Redmond Area Transportation Study was an action item of the 2005 Transportation Master Plan. It had three focus areas: freight mobility, preliminary design for NE 76th Street, and a subarea transportation plan for the Bear Creek and Southeast Redmond neighborhoods. The subarea plan was completed in early 2010 and its recommendations were brought forward to the Planning Commission in March 2010. The Planning Commission subsequently recommended that a set of transportation improvements be added to the Buildout Transportation Plan. The City Council adopted this recommendation in May 2010 (attached to this matrix) Staff encouraged neighborhood plan update stakeholders to participate in the transportation plan update in order that the transportation plan reflect neighborhood priorities. The transportation plan update served as the forum for project-level input. The neighborhood plan contains policy guidance that staff believes is consistent with the outcome of the transportation plan update. The response to the second part of this issue is related to the response to the first. The Greater Southeast Redmond Area Transportation Study identifies long-term improvements to address circulation, connectivity, and congestion issues in the Avondale corridor. In the short-term, two	Opened 10/27 Closed 11/10

	projects are underway that address Avondale: the extension of 196th Avenue NE from NE 95th Street to Novelty Hill Road, and the completion of the SR 520 flyover of Redmond Way. <u>Public Comment</u> <u>PC Comments</u> 11/10: Commissioners were satisfied with the staff response.	
3. Policy #25 emphasizes capacity vs. focusing on personal mobility and travel providing choices to people. (Miller)	<u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> 11/10: This policy is intended to communicate that the City should support transit over building more lanes on Avondale Road. The idea is to use what lane capacity exists today as efficiently as possible before resorting to other options. Supporting transit is one way to do that. 11/17: Staff concurs with the Commission. The revised policy would read: *Support reliable and frequent regional transit service in the Avondale Road corridor to increase personal mobility within the existing right-of-way.* <u>Public Comment</u> <u>PC Comments</u> 11/17: Commissioner Miller suggested incorporating the term "personal mobility" into the policy. Others agreed this would be a good idea.	Opened 10/27 Closed 11/10
4. Policy #28 suggests using special pavement treatment in bicycle lanes as a way to discourage speeding; this may not be a good idea. (Miller)	<u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> 11/10: Pavement treatments might include pavement treated or painted to be another color (green is used in Seattle, Portland and elsewhere at bicycle-vehicle conflict points). Any treatment would be evaluated for safety and efficacy by staff before use. 11/17: Staff concurs with the Commission's suggestion. The revised policy would read: *Discourage speeding on Avondale Road. In addition to regular enforcement activities, achieve this by altering the street cross-section such as by adding planting or using other design techniques or best practices.* <u>Public Comment</u> 11/17: Steve Thompson of the CAC submitted written testimony indicating that the intent of	Opened 10/27 Closed 11/17

	policy #28 is to address speeding. <u>PC Comments</u> 11/10: Commissioner O'Hara and others suggested alternative language like "best practices" and "design" rather than "special pavement treatment". Others supported this idea and asked staff to draft revised language.	
5. Policy #34 directs the City to evaluate the use of bus pull-outs during future planning efforts; Metro has strong opinions on the use of bus pull-outs. (Miller)	<u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> 11/10: Staff and the CAC are aware that Metro prefers not to use bus pull-outs because it is then more difficult to pull-in to traffic. The CAC feels strongly that this issue should at least be considered during future Avondale corridor planning efforts. 11/17: Staff is inquiring with other City and Metro staff to provide more information to the Commission at the Commission's meeting on November 17th. For now, staff is not recommending any changes to the policy language. 12/1: Staff proposes revised language for this policy that focuses on what the policy is trying to achieve, rather than on specific techniques. The proposed language is: *Evaluate strategies in future Avondale corridor planning efforts that would:* • *Improve safety for students walking and riding the bus to school, and,* • *Reduce impediments to traffic flow that don't facilitate speeding.* 12/15: The recommended policy language is included in Exhibit A. <u>Public Comment</u> 11/10: Steve Thompson of the CAC noted that this issue is partly about school buses, since they do not use pull-outs and stop both lanes of traffic when picking-up/dropping-off students. 11/17: Sue Stewart, a Redmond resident and long-time transit safety officer, testified in oral and written testimony about the impacts of bus pull-outs on transit service. <u>PC Comments</u> 11/10: Vice Chair Gregory asked staff to inquire with Metro as to its rationale for preferring not to use pull-outs. Commissioner Miller suggested inviting Sue Stewart, a Code Rewrite Commissioner and Metro safety officer. Commissioner Miller was concerned about including	Opened 10/27 Closed 12/1

	public transit vehicles in the policy language and suggested restricting the issue to school buses. Others did not see a problem with "evaluating" the use of bus pull-outs for both transit and school buses (as the policy language reads). 11/17: After a discussion among the Commissioners and Ms. Stewart, the Commission decided it would be best to draft language for policy #34 that emphasizes the objectives of the policy rather than specific techniques that would achieve the objectives. 12/1: Planning Commissioners recommended creating separating the second bullet of the proposed policy into two separate bullets.	
6. Policies #21 and #22 mention a community gathering space. What could this be? (Biethan)	<u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> 11/10: As Commissioners noted on October 27, policy #50 provides additional description of the community gathering space. This language could be referenced or incorporated into policies #21 and #22. 11/17: A paragraph introducing policies 21 and 22 is proposed to follow policy 20. It reads: *Policies 21 and 22 describe criteria for potential future rezone requests to Neighborhood Commercial or Multi-Family Urban in the Avondale corridor. One important criterion is that one indoor gathering place be provided through a rezone. After one indoor gathering place is provided, the criterion would no longer apply. See policy 50 for more description of an indoor gathering place.* Policy 50 is also revised as follows: *Look for opportunities to locate <u>one</u> publicly- or privately-owned indoor gathering place, such as a community hall or café. Such a place might also serve as a library book drop or include meeting rooms.* <u>Public Comment</u> <u>PC Comments</u> 11/10: Commissioners concurred with staff's suggestion.	Opened 10/27 Closed 11/17
7. Policies #11-#20 seem to emphasize constraining agriculture vs. conserving	<u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> 11/10: Agriculture is mentioned in policies #14 and #16. In #14 agricultural uses are encouraged to use best practices to protect stream and aquifer health. In #16, agriculture is one of several uses listed as appropriate in the floodplain.	Opened 10/27 Closed 11/10

agriculture. Also, how is open space addressed in this plan? (Miller)	Growth Management Act goals related to resource lands and the environment read, respectively, as follows: • Natural resource industries. Maintain and enhance natural resource-based industries, including productive timber, agricultural, and fisheries industries. Encourage the conservation of productive forest lands and productive agricultural lands, and discourage incompatible uses. • Environment. Protect the environment and enhance the state's high quality of life, including air and water quality, and the availability of water. Staff believes the neighborhood plan policies strike a balance consistent with GMA planning goals. Open space is addressed in policies #3 (view corridor), #16 (clustering development), and #49 (openness of Bear/Evans Valley). <u>Public Comment</u> 11/10: Steve Thompson of the CAC commented that everyone on the CAC is excited about agriculture, but that no one knows what will be economically feasible in the next 30 years. <u>PC Comments</u> 11/10: Commissioner Miller added that agriculture is related to the issue of access for fresh food. He and other Commissioners were satisfied with staff's response.	