Planning Commission Issues Matrix, *February 23, 2011*
2010 – 2011 Comprehensive Plan Update – TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT
(An asterisk denotes crossover issue – pertains to other Elements)*

Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
1. *Should the mode split goals for Downtown and Overlake be in the Urban Center or Transportation policies or Framework Policies? (Hinman)	Staff Comment/Recommendation: 2/23: VISION 2040 directs local jurisdictions with regional growth centers to develop subarea plans for those centers. In addition, the Puget Sound Regional Council requires that these plans include mode split goals for the centers. The Urban Centers Element of Redmond's Comprehensive Plan is the core of those plans for the Downtown and Overlake. Staff believes that mode split goals are best located in the Urban Center Element policies. Public Comment PC Comment:	Opened 2/9/11
2. Will the Downtown Connector allow enough visibility for potential future operation of trolleys? (Hinman)	Staff Comment/Recommendation: 2/23: The Redmond Central Connector Master Plan will evaluate the feasibility of operating a trolley. If the City Council agrees to approve trolley operations, the trolley alignment will be incorporated into the master plan. Public Comment PC Comment:	Opened 2/9/11

Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
3. Should Policy TR-6 address freight, service and goods delivery? (Hinman)	Staff Comment/Recommendation: 2/23: The City's approach under this policy is to identify and design certain streets so that they can safely accommodate the needs of freight, service and goods delivery vehicles, in contrast to reducing the number of trips made on Redmond's street system. Public Comment PC Comment:	Opened 2/9/11
4. Concern about the efficiency of the SR 520 on- and off-ramp operations. (Hinman)	Staff Comment/Recommendation: 2/23: The City is concerned about traffic operations related to the SR 520/West Lake Sammamish Pkwy. NE on- and off-ramps, including the connection to Leary Way. This will be examined through the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) process. Public Comment PC Comment:	Opened 2/9/11
5. Concern about using safety as an emphasis versus safety as a value. (Miller)	Staff Comment/Recommendation: 2/16: Safety is a value that has to be considered in the development and operation of Redmond's transportation system. Further discussion might help clarify how safety is incorporated in the various transportation policies. Public Comment PC Comment:	Opened 2/9/11

Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
6. Policy TR-6, first bullet point: what does "connected" mean in this context? (Miller)	Staff Comment/Recommendation: 2/16: The word "connected" as used in this policy refers to a linkage of streets that are identified and designed to support the movement of freight and goods by trucks between manufacturing and industrial uses within Redmond, and between Redmond and the region. Public Comment PC Comment:	Opened 2/9/11
7. Which streets can be shared local streets according to Policy TR-7? (Miller)	Staff Comment/Recommendation: 2/16: This policy applies only to local streets that meet the specified qualifications of low traffic volumes and speeds, and an opportunity for active public use of street space. Public Comment PC Comment:	Opened 2/9/11
8. The Downtown Connector and the East Lake Sammamish Trail need to be well-connected through the SR 520/SR 202 interchange. (Miller)	Staff Comment/Recommendation: 2/23: King County will design and build this connection in coordination with the City. Public Comment PC Comment:	Opened 2/9/11

Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
9. On p. 8, line 3: use of the word "consider" may not be strong enough to ensure that the needs of bicyclists, pedestrians and transit users are incorporated into the design of roadway projects. (Miller)	Staff Comment/Recommendation: 2/16: The policies in this section are stronger and directive in this aspect than the introduction to the policies in this section, and the word "consider" should be changed to reflect this. Public Comment PC Comment:	Opened 2/9/11
10. Policy TR-17, second bullet point: need to use a stronger word than "consider". (Miller)	Staff Comment/Recommendation: 2/16: Staff will return with a recommendation. Public Comment PC Comment:	Opened 2/9/11
11. Policy TR-18, third bullet point: are incentives the best approach when implementing TDM strategies? Should disincentives be avoided when there are no transportation alternatives? (Miller)	Staff Comment/Recommendation: 2/23: This approach is consistent with current City policy to use both incentives and disincentives in the design of the TDM program, and for fairness, to avoid penalties where travel options do not exist. Public Comment PC Comment:	Opened 2/9/11

Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
12. Policy TR-20: in establishing minimum and maximum parking ratios, how much consideration should the City place on constraints established by financial institutions? (Miller)	Staff Comment/Recommendation: 2/23: This policy allows the City to consider, but not be subject to parking constraints imposed by financial institutions. This is a reasonable approach to using parking ratios to regulate parking consistent with the City's transportation policies. Public Comment PC Comment:	Opened 2/9/11
13. Describe the history of the Plan-Based approach to transportation concurrency. (Miller)	Staff Comment/Recommendation: 2/23: The purpose of the Plan-Based approach is to ensure that the funding of transportation improvements occurs in proportion to the needs of the City and the pace of growth. The Plan-Based transportation concurrency regulations are a significant improvement because they establish a relationship between the implementation of all projects in the TFP which add multimodal transportation capacity needed to serve new growth, instead of focusing on just projects that add vehicle capacity at intersections. The updates to the Comprehensive Plan and TMP in 2005 set the direction for the Plan-Based concurrency approach. The City completed significant technical work and community outreach to develop the regulations. The Planning Commission and City Council reviewed and then ultimately approved the regulations in 2009. Public Comment PC Comment:	Opened 2/9/11

Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
14. *Are parking policies more effective if placed in one or two Comprehensive Plan elements? (Bethan)	Staff Comment/Recommendation: 2/23: Generally, policies addressing parking issues, should be incorporated into the Transportation Element policies. However, specific issues related to parking can appropriately be addressed as necessary in different plan elements. Public Comment PC Comment:	Opened 2/9/11
15. *Terms referring to the East Link light rail line need to be consistently used in the Comprehensive Plan elements. (Hinman)	Staff Comment/Recommendation: 2/23: References to high capacity transit should be updated to specify light rail, reflecting voter approval of ST2, and the construction of the East Link light rail line connecting Redmond with Bellevue and the region. Public Comment PC Comment:	Opened 2/9/11
16. *Should "way-finding" be addressed in the Transportation Element? (Hinman)	Staff Comment/Recommendation: 2/23: Staff would benefit from further discussion of this issue, before proposing a specific response. Public Comment PC Comment:	Opened 2/9/11

Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
17. Access to transit service. (Cindy Jayne, Sustainable Redmond)	Staff Comment/Recommendation 2/23: The City supports locating transit routes in a way that balances transit service coverage and access with efficient service operations. This means locating routes in a way that attracts higher ridership (dense residential and commercial areas, urban centers) and best coverage of the City. Allocating service based on half-mile coverage criteria alone, without priorities, would not result in the most effective or efficient transit service to Redmond residents and businesses. Public Comment 2/16: Insure that transit routes are within one-half mile of Redmond residences and businesses. PC Comment:	Opened 2/16/11
18. Policy TR-32. (Don Marcy, Microsoft)	Staff Comment/Recommendation: 2/23: The policy is intended to recognize the importance of equally valuing community character and transportation capacity and where there are conflicts, to take steps to minimize or mitigate the impacts. For example, completion of a gap in the sidewalk system if constructed of the standard width could lead to removal of a tree treasured by the neighborhood. Alternatively, the improvement could be designed to be narrower or could by routed around the tree to avoid removing the tree. The intent of this policy is to provide for this kind of evaluation and alternative. Public Comment 2/16: Should not value community character equally with transportation capacity in all cases. Some important transportation improvements may conflict to some degree with community character. PC Comment:	Opened 2/16/11

Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
19. Policy TR-20 supports reducing parking ratios as more travel options become available. (Don Marcy, Microsoft)	Staff Comment/Recommendation: 2/23: Staff will be prepared to respond to this issue on Feb. 23. Public Comment 2/16: Policy TR-20 supports reducing minimum and maximum parking ratios further as transportation options increase with development of enhanced transit service or as demand is managed with achievement of mode split goals. Property owners should not be punished for achieving mode split targets. Current parking ratios are not sufficient (too little parking is allowed) and create problems for existing commercial developments. The situation will be worse should the ratios be reduced further. PC Comment:	Opened 2/16/11
20. Policy TR-41 supports using mode split targets for each of the primary travel modes. (Don Marcy, Microsoft)	Staff Comment/Recommendation: 2/23: Staff will provide a recommendation. Public Comment 2/16: Why is it necessary to establish separate mode targets for walking, bicycling and transit? PC Comment:	Opened 2/16/11

02/18/2011

o:\terry m\transportation policies\110217a issues table.docx