

**REDMOND PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES**

June 22, 2011

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chairman Hinman, Vice Chair Wiechers-Gregory, Commissioners Biethan, Chandorkar, Flynn, O'Hara, and Miller

COMMISSIONERS EXCUSED: Commissioner Bontadelli; Julinsey

STAFF PRESENT: Sarah Stiteler, Cathy Beam, and Thara Johnson, Redmond Planning Department

RECORDING SECRETARY: Lady of Letters, Inc.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Hinman in the Council Chambers at City Hall.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

No changes to the agenda.

ITEMS FROM THE AUDIENCE

There were no questions or comments from the audience.

PUBLIC HEARING AND STUDY SESSION, Green Building/Infrastructure Incentive Programs, presented by Thara Johnson, City of Redmond Associate Planner, Development Review Division

Chairman Hinman opened the public meeting and noted there was no one from the public signed up to speak. He asked Ms. Johnson if there were any written items from the public on this issue; she confirmed there were not. Chairman Hinman closed the oral portion of the public hearing. The written portion will stay open until at least next week. Chairman Hinman invited Ms. Johnson to speak.

Ms. Johnson said this proposal stems from a recommendation of the Code Rewrite process, which occurred primarily in 2010. The Code Rewrite Commission (CRC) recommended that the Planning Commission expand the Green Building and Infrastructure Incentive Programs. Also, staff has met with non-residential developers in Redmond regarding this proposal to gain feedback. There will be future meetings with City Council study sessions and future open meetings where interested parties may testify.

Ms. Johnson said these incentives programs are meant to further the goals of the City's Sustainability Plan. She also noted that in 2013, there are other mandatory requirements that will go into effect. One requirement comes from the state Department of Ecology, which would mandate low-impact development citywide as part of the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System Program. Also, the International Building Code is going to be amended to include a green building section, the International Green Construction Code. Also, there is

language in the City of Redmond Comprehensive Plan that speaks to encouraging low-impact development and green building practices through incentives. Currently, the Zoning Code has a green infrastructure program that has been in place since 2008. Ms. Johnson said not much development has come through this program, which targets primarily residential development. Last year, the CRC recommended expanding the program to include non-residential development.

The proposal before the Commission includes some updates to the residential program, including the change of removing the *three-star built green* incentive. Ms. Johnson said this is because most single-family homes already meet that standard and therefore should not be incentivized. Also, the State Energy Code has been updated, and many of the new energy requirements mandate compliance with the three-star standard. Staff has proposed to include incentives only at the four- and five-star level, and no longer provide an incentive at the three-star level.

As the CRC recommended, staff has proposed expanding the incentive program to non-residential development in the City with the exception of two zones: the Bear Creek Design District, primarily an environmental protection area, and the neighborhood commercial zones, where staff does not anticipate the need for the use of these incentives. Commissioner Chandorkar asked if the Code had standards at the three-star level, or if developers were simply taking the initiative to use the three-star standard. Ms. Johnson confirmed it was the latter case. The Washington State Energy Code has stringent requirements as well, that already meet the standard.

Staff has proposed an incentive that would allow developers to reduce their minimum parking requirements within the Downtown and Overlake zones if the development is located within a quarter mile of a transit stop. Other incentives include the allowance of reduced setbacks by 50% if developments are in certain zones next to non-residential zones: the general design district, general commercial, business park and manufacturing park in the industrial zone. Developers could take a reduction of the setbacks by 25% if their project is located next to a residential zone. Staff wants to maintain a proper buffer between residential and non-residential zones. There are floor area and height bonuses possible primarily in the Downtown and Overlake zones, but the current Code only allows those bonuses through the purchase of transfer of development rights. Therefore, staff has proposed that developers can get those floor area and height bonuses if they comply with the green building standards, without the purchase of development rights.

The incentives that will remain the same specific to residential development are as follows:

1. Green building certification, with four- and five-star level standards
2. Requirement of vegetation and soil retention
3. Drought-tolerant landscaping, minimum site disturbance practices
4. Permeable materials and green roofs
5. Density bonuses

Also, lot clustering could allow developers to include smaller lots as part of a development, creating variation in the types of single-family homes offered. Tree preservation regulations, road infrastructure reduction, design standards, and neighborhood design standards will all remain the same. Reviewing the new provisions proposed for the Code amendment, Ms. Johnson noted the following:

1. Expanding the incentives program to non-residential zones except as noted above
2. Removing the three-star built green technique for the residential zone

3. Incorporating additional techniques for developers to earn points, such as through the Water Sense efficiency program, providing an electric vehicle charging station, or using alternate energy sources, such as solar power, and complying with LEED Gold standards.

Commissioner Miller asked how some incentives might help reduce street extent and paving throughout the City. He wanted to make sure that City policies regarding reducing miles driven do not conflict with pedestrian connectivity, for example. Chairman Hinman noted that there are some curb-less and sidewalk-less neighborhoods that deal with this issue. Ms. Johnson added that through the residential incentive program, there is an alternative road standard, but that is not applicable to the non-residential program. She did not believe this covers the elimination of sidewalk requirements.

Commissioner Biethan raised a question about the cost of a green program, and Chairman Hinman said that would come up in the issues matrix. Commissioner Flynn asked how the International Building Code would affect the City's Code. Ms. Johnson said as the IBC changes, the City Code changes as well, and becomes a requirement for developments. Chairman Hinman noted that it may be that only certain segments of the IBC would be adopted by the City.

Ms. Johnson reviewed the questions raised during the June 15 study session on this topic. The primary questions revolve around the mandatory requirements that stem from Council's performance measures, which were adopted through the 2011-12 budget proposal. Staff heard general support for the incentive program, with few questions around the bonuses or provisions proposed. There was significant interest in the International Green Construction Code. As yet, Ms. Johnson does not have any more details. Commission members supported staff's plan that the City would be working with the state and other jurisdictions as those details become available. It is unclear what portions of the IGCC the state will adopt. City Council has not set any policy regarding green building requirements.

The Commission has been supportive of the incentive program. Staff has proposed that the sunset date of the end of 2012 or beginning of 2013 should be removed from this program. Also, staff would work with other entities at a statewide level to promote the International Green Construction Code, per Commission recommendation. Right now, the plan is to amend the proposed draft code language staff has presented. Chairman Hinman asked how staff would deal with the IGCC. Ms. Johnson said staff would come back with a revised draft code that removes the mandatory requirements, so there would be no reference to the IGCC within the Code. When the IGCC is adopted internationally, and when the state makes a decision as to what portion of the IGCC will be adopted, or gives the City the authority to make that decision, that would happen through the Building Code, not the Zoning Code. That would be consistent with what other jurisdictions are doing. Building officials believe the IGCC would come online in 2014.

Commissioner Biethan asked how states are able to enforce parts of the International Building Code, and if all jurisdictions in the state then have to follow the state's lead. Ms. Johnson said there is some flexibility provided in that the City could add portions of the IBC beyond the state requirement and add more emphasis to certain issues like environmental protection.

Commissioner Biethan confirmed with Ms. Johnson that the IBC would basically provide a minimum code for all jurisdictions; each jurisdiction could then decide if there would be more regulatory oversight in certain areas. Cathy Beam, principal planner with the Planning Department noted that the authority for that decision in Redmond would be the Building

Department, but the Council would have final authorization power. That decision would not go through the Planning Commission, as these are generally more technically-oriented concerns.

Commissioner Biethan was concerned that there are still policy implications. Commissioner Gregory said he feels more comfortable with this process, as it becomes codified at that point rather than a recommendation by the City. Ms. Johnson will confer with the Building Department about Commissioner Biethan's concerns. Chairman Hinman noted this would be a future issue: how the notification and implementation process works, and how the Commission would be involved.

Commissioner Flynn asked what developers have been saying to staff about these issues. Ms. Johnson said a developer she met with was hesitant about the mandatory requirements. However, because this is now an incentive for bonuses rather than a requirement, it appears to be more palatable.

Chairman Hinman looked at the issue matrix, and raised Issue #1, regarding transportation mitigation within a green building context. Commissioner Miller noted that green incentives have to be meaningful to initiate action. Plus, there must be measurable results from these programs. He was not clear how this program would create measurable goals in terms of transportation. Commissioner Miller was also not clear on how LEED certification affects the operations and programmatic sides of a building. He wanted to be clear on what to tell developers or members of the public about such a program. Ms. Johnson said a pilot project could help provide some of the details Commissioner Miller was looking for. Chairman Hinman asked if the Transportation Department could provide some help; Ms. Johnson said that could happen. Ms. Beam added that the Transportation Master Plan, currently under review, could be of assistance as well. Chairman Hinman will leave this issue open. Commissioner Julinsey pointed out that there is a Natural Environments element on the agenda later and there is a section covering the Climate Action Plan that may address Commissioner Miller's questions.

Issue #2 dealt with LEED credits and cost differentials associated with them. Commissioner Chandorkar noted that there is a big difference between the requirements for LEED Silver vs. LEED Gold. He asked if developers would have a disincentive to go for LEED Gold. Ms. Johnson said the mandatory requirement to meet those Gold standards has been removed. Commissioner Biethan noted that in many office developments, LEED Gold makes sense. He asked if a current project that is going for that standard could provide guidance to the Commission, in terms of the costs a developer is paying and the benefits received. Chairman Hinman said that would provide some good background, as part of a workshop. Commissioner O'Hara said he would not like to see development like the ones in the Overlake neighborhood put on hold due to the decision between LEED Gold and Silver.

Ms. Johnson pointed out that two studies were reviewed for this issue, one in 2003 and one in 2009. There is a cost by each credit noted in these reports, with a comparison that shows a 2% difference, on average, between LEED Silver, Gold and Platinum. That equates to three to five dollars per square foot in increased cost. The study showed energy efficiency benefits, with 28% more efficiency at the Certified Level, 30% at Silver, and 48% at Gold. Savings in other utilities, added productivity, and health benefits were studied as well, with a dollar amount assigned to these benefits with the cost of building green. The twenty-year net benefit for building green

would be between \$50 and \$60. Commissioner Biethan noted that some of these benefits were tenant benefits, not necessarily owner benefits.

Commissioner Chandorkar was concerned about how the benefits for health and productivity were determined. Commissioner Flynn asked if there were other benefits for a developer, such as getting a better sale or rental price on a building that is LEED Certified. Chairman Hinman said that happens in the residential market; he was not sure about the non-residential. Commissioner O'Hara said the data answers his concerns about this issue. Commissioner Gregory said the hard costs only, not the productivity and health benefits, would create a better comparison. Commissioner Biethan noted that these costs can be unclear amounts. Ms. Johnson will provide a link to this 2003 study that the Commission can examine. Ms. Johnson next mentioned the 2009 study, which assesses the cost differential caused by each credit. Commissioners had no questions on this specific study. Chairman Hinman said that Issue #2 will be closed, dependent on staff providing the aforementioned link and forwarding more details to Commissioners who have not received them.

Issue #3 addresses where Redmond stands in comparison to other jurisdictions relative to Code amendment. Commissioner Biethan was pleased with the progress made by staff on this issue, and Chairman Hinman closed this issue.

Issue #4, about the authority of local jurisdictions, was a concern of Commissioner Gregory's. He said that his questions have been addressed. Ms. Johnson has talked with the City Attorney, and has not found any cases or lawsuits on this issue. Chairman Hinman closed this issue.

Issue #5, regarding sites that are not conducive to sustainability development or compatible with LEED, was raised by Commissioner Bontadelli, who was not present. Chairman Hinman closed this issue.

With Issue #6, regarding permeable materials, the Public Works Department has weighed in. Ms. Johnson said that permeable materials can be used in certain wellhead protection zones, specifically Zones 3 and 4 within the City. There is an incompatibility within the City regarding maintenance of permeable materials. Ms. Johnson said that will have to be an ongoing discussion. Commissioner Miller said the City has to make a commitment to supporting that type of material. Ms. Beam noted there was a challenge in Wellhead Protection Zones 1 and 2, which serve the drinking water for half of the City. Walkways and roof runoff are allowed to have some permeable material, but currently not for streets. Commissioner Miller said he was satisfied with the explanation, and Chairman Hinman closed the issue.

Issue #7, the directive relative to transitioning the incentive program in 2013, has been addressed already, according to Chairman Hinman. He would like a trigger date to implement additional measures. Commissioner Biethan said the issue has gone away. Chairman Hinman was still concerned about the date. Staff had looked at the year 2013 as a transition date because it is the City's centennial. Chairman Hinman closed this issue.

Issue #8 dealt with the International Green Construction Code. Chairman Hinman noted that this issue will stay open to figure out how the process to implement the IGCC in the future. It will most likely be discussed at the next meeting.

Issue #9 was in regard to transit stops in particular locations. Ms. Johnson said a map dealing with that still has to be developed. Commissioner Miller would like to see how the distances that are incentives for developers could truly impact new development. Chairman Hinman closed this issue.

Issue #10 was a definition issue raised by Commissioner Gregory regarding fuels and fueling station infrastructure. Ms. Johnson said that information is still under development; staff will be back in touch with the Commission. Chairman Hinman closed this issue. In review, Issues #1 and #8 are still open. Chairman Hinman said he would like to know when it would be reasonable to see draft revisions. Ms. Johnson said draft coding would be available for next week's meeting, which Chairman Hinman believed would be a straightforward process. Ms. Stiteler noted there were a number of topics already on the agenda next week, but she would put these topics on the agenda. Chairman Hinman pointed out that the written portion of the comment period on this hearing would remain open, and concluded this agenda item for the night. The Commission took a short recess at this point.

STUDY SESSION, Natural Environment Element, Limited Shoreline Master Program (SMP) Amendment and Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO) Amendment - FEMA Floodplain Management presented by Cathy Beam, City of Redmond Principal Planner

Commissioner Julinsey led the discussion on this study session, and asked Ms. Beam for some background. Ms. Beam said the Limited Shoreline Master Program Amendment involves the required Natural Environment Element of the Comprehensive Plan as well as FEMA compliance, which are required to be in place by September 22, 2011. All of the environment, critical areas, and flooding policies and regulations are incorporated by reference into the Shoreline Master Program, so whenever the City changes reference documents like the SMP or CAO, they have to go through the State Department of Ecology. Ms. Beam said there would be no changes to the main parts of the SMP, which include shoreline regulations and policies.

The proposed changes respond to four main items:

1. The FEMA Endangered Species Act compliance
2. Regional and county-wide planning policies regarding climate change
3. The City Planning goals of being a sustainable community
4. Making sure the Natural Environment Element is aligned with other elements of the Comprehensive Plan

In 2008, there was a Biological Opinion issued by the National Marine Fisheries Service for the Puget Sound Chinook. As part of the Opinion, FEMA had to evaluate its floodplain regulations to see how they would be in compliance with that opinion. As a result, FEMA put out a draft model ordinance at the end of last year. Cities in the Northwest, such as Redmond, must make sure that local regulations are consistent with FEMA regulations. Ms. Beam noted that FEMA develops flood insurance rate maps, which are used to assess the City's flood insurance rates. This allows the City to provide flood insurance to properties in the floodplain.

Ms. Beam showed the Commission a map of floodplain areas around the City. A good portion of downtown Redmond sits in the 100-year floodplain. To maintain flood insurance, the City has to be in compliance with FEMA regulations. The deadline for compliance is September 22nd. If not compliant, the City could lose its flood insurance rates. Staff is proposing only a few changes to

the Natural Environment Element and the Critical Areas Ordinance to help the City meet the FEMA requirements. Compensation floodplain storage is one tweak. Currently, the City requires compensating storage in all parts of the city except for developments in Downtown along the Sammamish River which lie within its floodplain. Ms. Beam said the current FEMA rule does not allow the exemption of Downtown, which will present a challenge in that the river has been dredged in the past and does not have connectivity to the floodplain.

Since January, staff has met with FEMA to create a regional project for Downtown developers that they could buy into. This would be north of NE 90th Street, a funded compensation project that is in the City's six-year capital improvement plan. The City ran models to show if all of Downtown Redmond were filled to the 100-year floodplain elevation, what the necessary volume would be to compensate for. Ms. Beam said the models show a project can be built that can compensate properly. Thus, the City proposed to FEMA that there should be an option for Downtown developers. If they do not want their compensating floodplain storage on site, they can buy into the regional project. FEMA gave a verbal okay, and Downtown developers as well as the City Council are very satisfied. The policy and regulatory changes reflect the need to eliminate the exemption for development Downtown and the ability to buy into the compensation property. Ms. Beam noted that there is no way to get around this exemption issue.

The compensation project is similar to four other restoration projects the City has built along the Sammamish River, which involve restoring habitat. Instead of providing the site compensatory floodplain storage for each new development, a regional system, with a cost that is assessed to participating developers, will be implemented. Each volume unit would have a cost allocated to the project. It is basically a fee in lieu of having developers do this work individually. Commissioner Flynn asked how the project would be built over the years. Ms. Beam explained that staff told FEMA the City would like six years from the start point on which to be able to build that project, which is a common length of time for transportation improvements, and FEMA found that reasonable. Some projects may build before the capacity is available at the compensation site, but the concept has been given a verbal okay from FEMA. The City has a good track record on river restoration projects. The compensation project will be several hundred feet long, and would consist of bank excavation. The trail along the river will remain, though it might have to be moved slightly.

Ms. Beam stated that there is a new section on climate change. There is general consensus among scientists, Ms. Beam said, that indicates that climate change is happening, and local areas can make an impact. Water is a key to this proposal, involving stormwater and general water systems. Ms. Beam has also been working on incorporating sustainability into the Comprehensive Plan. The Livable Redmond event helped develop guiding principles that the Council and Planning Commission have approved. There are also some policies involved based on a non-profit group called ICLEI, or Local Governments for Sustainability, of which Redmond is a member. The Star Community Index has also been cited, a recent program that is looking at a broad picture of sustainability and how communities can achieve that. Ms. Beam said she is looking at value stacking, and what the City is doing in the natural environment that could benefit the stormwater element and land use in the long term.

Ms. Beam has also proposed aligning with other elements, mainly the Capital Facilities, Utilities, and Land Use Elements, relating to low-impact development, stormwater, and the water utility. The changes proposed deal with the Wellhead Protection Program and incorporation into the

Comprehensive Plan. Reclaimed water re-use has been addressed, as well as encouraging infiltration of clean runoff on non-polluting surfaces.

All of these policies are being updated to address the FEMA issue and Comprehensive Plan periodic update. The City has to file these changes with the Department of Commerce and FEMA, and as well as the Department of Ecology, due to the amendment of the Shoreline Master Program. There are many layers involved, but ultimately, the Shoreline Master Program changes happen at the very end, once the Commission has made a recommendation and the City Council has made a decision. FEMA requirements are driving the schedule, due to the September 22nd deadline. The City should finish its process over the next two months; FEMA should give its approval sometime this summer. The Department of Ecology received a packet of information about these proposals from the City in early June. The DOE will hold a separate hearing on this in Redmond.

Commissioner Julinsey asked if these changes were approved by Council and noting that one of the provisions require the removal of fish barriers, if that removal had to be complete before the September 22nd deadline from FEMA. Ms. Beam confirmed the policy would have to be in place, but the action of removing fish barriers would not have to happen by that deadline.

Commissioner Julinsey said aspects of sustainability have been well reflected by staff in all the exhibits, with an emphasis on education. She asked Commissioners about the proposed changes of Exhibit B, classification of frequently flooded areas, which was discussed earlier. Commissioner Biethan confirmed that this is to conform to FEMA guidelines. Commissioner Chandorkar asked if the City had to coordinate with King County on this effort, given that parts of the river were county property. Ms. Beam said that the county has to update with FEMA as well. The proposed changes to the definition of *development* have been made to comply with FEMA also. Ms. Beam explained that there was little choice on this matter in order to keep the City's flood insurance intact. The City already has a definition of *development*, but the new definition aligns with FEMA's requirements.

Commissioner Julinsey asked what this meant for Downtown Redmond. Ms. Beam said that people who live and work there will have no change; those who want to buy property there or redevelop would have to be careful about filling on a project, and perhaps buy into compensating floodplain storage. Commissioner Chandorkar confirmed that the staff has determined a volume of compensating fill amount. However, Ms. Beam has not figured out the final fees that would be collected from that amount. The Commissioners had no further questions on Exhibits B and C and moved to Exhibit A.

Commissioner Julinsey asked about policy NE-14, using science-based mitigation to offset unavoidable adverse impacts, and if there were some examples. Ms. Beam said that if there was a wetland mitigation project, for example, the mitigation process should not be a judgment call of a developer, but rather should use a guiding document such as one from the Department of Ecology. The idea is to obtain a no net loss goal. Commissioner Julinsey asked next about policy NE-32, which talks about planning, deploying, and maintaining physical and social infrastructure. Ms. Beam said this policy addresses the idea of natural hazards and disaster preparedness. The Fire Department deals with disaster preparedness, but staff wants this addressed in the Comprehensive Plan so that the City is aware of this issue, from crisis response to social infrastructure and networking.

Chairman Hinman asked if this text would be more useful in the early introductory comments around NE-11. Ms. Beam agreed. Commissioner Chandorkar noted that NE-31 and NE-32 deal with hazard-related policies, which are specific to geologic hazards. The Commission discussed where the best place for this text would be, in terms of organization. Ms. Beam noted that it would make sense to move this section to an area after NE-11. Most of the Commission agreed to move this section to the front, as suggested by Chairman Hinman, as an overarching principle. Commissioner Flynn noted, however, that only the geological issues deal with a community-wide emergency. Flooding could be a big issue, also, he noted. Commissioner Gregory noted that some weather events could create emergencies as well. The majority of the Commission agreed to move this section to the front.

Commissioner Julinsey next asked about NE-39, contaminated sites, and how Redmond does not have many contaminated sites. She asked where those sites are located and how they are cleaned up. Ms. Beam said the City has been cleaning up these sites. She said a map could be provided, possibly using City and state resources. Many of these sites are old gas stations and dry-cleaning sites. Ms. Beam noted that there is the possibility of accidents like fuel spills in the future. From a planning perspective, the City is set up to minimize risk, and the City mails out yearly notices showing its compliance regarding drinking water cleanliness.

Commissioner Chandorkar asked about reducing the *amount of impervious* in frequently flooded areas. The word *surface* should be added, Ms. Beam said, and noted that this was a policy. She thanked Commissioner Chandorkar for pointing out this issue, and noted this would reduce the amount of effective impervious surface in floodplains and uplands contributing runoff to downstream floodplains. Commissioner Miller asked about NE-52, and why the phrase *outside the Downtown and Overlake urban centers* had been added. He asked why impervious surfaces would be limited outside these areas, and not inside these areas, if possible. Ms. Beam said the idea is to recognize those urban centers and create density. Commissioner Miller said it does not read well, semantically. He will get back to staff with a suggested rewrite.

Commissioner Julinsey asked next about NE-62, the Water Resource Inventory Area (WRIA). Ms. Beam explained that the state is broken up into these areas, and the City is in WRIA 8, which is the Cedar-Sammamish River Basin. Redmond is just one jurisdiction contained in this area, and the City works with other agencies on environmental concerns in the WRIA. Commissioner Chandorkar asked why *and support* was added to this item, and if there was some change in the Zoning Code that would raise any questions about that support. Ms. Beam noted that watershed planning is not part of the Zoning Code. It is a separate component in the City in the Natural Resources Division. It is similar to other programs and efforts that are not zoning-related. Ultimately, the Watershed Plan underway will be adopted by the City, which could then have implications on updating or modifying the Zoning Code. Ms. Beam said NE62 is the first step in doing inventory work and running models.

Commissioner Biethan asked about policy 68A, maintaining natural hydrological functions with the City's ecosystems and watersheds and, where feasible, restoring them to a more natural state. He asked what was feasible and who would do the restoring. Ms. Beam said this was part of watershed planning, and noted that she did not want to over commit the City in terms of money and resources. She admitted that *feasible* is not a strong term. Chairman Hinman noted that the idea is to allow for daylighting culverts, for example. Commissioner Biethan asked who this

applies to, and if developers have to comply. Ms. Beam said this is more of a generic statement, and the City takes on the brunt of the burden regarding hydrological functions. The City currently requires developers to create no net loss of ecological functions. Ms. Beam noted that this could be confusing to developers, and suggested that this could be modified for improvement.

Commissioner Julinsey spoke next about fish barriers in policy NE-76, and removing them. Policy NE-73 *encourages improvement, such as removing the fish barriers*. She asked if removing barriers was mandatory. Ms. Beam noted that this was simply an encouragement, not a regulation. Commissioner Chandorkar helped clear up the language between NE-73, more specific to bridges, and NE-76, and something that would create a fish barrier. Commissioner Biethan asked why developers should not be required to remove fish barriers. Ms. Beam noted that often the barriers are on nearby properties, not the actual property being developed, which is why the word *encourage* is used.

Chairman Hinman asked about an item near policy NE-79A dealing with core preservations and quality habitat areas. Ms. Beam apologized for not bringing a map, but pointed out that the City had *wildlife habitat conservation areas*, which were already mapped due to Growth Management Act criteria of what qualifies them. There are also *quality habitat areas*, which provide some level of habitat. Many years ago, the City had a wildlife habitat plan developed that showed vegetative cover and connectivity between wildlife areas. In the CAO, there is a section about what makes up a quality habitat. Therefore, developers are encouraged to preserve those habitat areas, which can be difficult. Chairman Hinman noted this was more of an informational question, and asked for some maps.

Commissioner O'Hara asked about NE-89, and an *anadromous* fishery. Ms. Beam noted that an *anadromous* fish lives part of its life cycle in salt water, and the other part in fresh water.

Commissioner Julinsey next asked about NE-94A, which uses the word *require*. Ms. Beam noted this was a requirement, using compost-amended soils during the development process. It is in the landscaping section and is in the best management practices of the City's stormwater manual. She agreed that this was a strong word, but it reflects the City's current regulations. Chairman Hinman said the City is trying to set an example for the private sector with NE-94, as well, and a possible educational piece.

Commissioner Julinsey asked about NE-103, which is similar to NE-76. She noted that the Code Rewrite Commission (CRC) had talked about *junk trees*, such as cottonwood and alder, and that for these trees there should not be a one-on-one ratio for replacement. Ms. Beam said the CRC did not believe these trees were on the same scale as evergreens. Commissioner Chandorkar said the value of retaining certain plant species is important. The City's significant tree policy deals with the size of a tree regardless of its species. Staff is recommending leaving out the term *junk trees*, and noted that all trees serve some function, such as helping with storm water runoff, improving air quality, reducing erosion, protecting wildlife habitat, and reducing noise and heat.

Commissioner Julinsey asked about the Climate Action Plan. It appeared the staff was in the early stages. Ms. Beam said staff is working on this plan which should be complete by the end of 2011. Staff has completed greenhouse gas emission inventories for City operations for 2008-2010, and for the community at large. The year 2008 would be the benchmark year. City Council

has asked staff to start the discussion about emission reductions. In general, the Council agreed there should be a policy about reducing emissions, and would like to see meaningful, achievable targets determined. Council members would like staff to show an average citizen how those targets would affect them. Commissioner Flynn asked about other communities. Ms. Beam said there are, through ICLEI in Seattle, Bellevue, Lynnwood, and Kirkland. This is a process that involves taking inventory, looking at targets, and determining benefits. The Council would like the City to serve as an example to the general public.

Commissioner Julinsey asked about NE-114B, which talked about outdoor air quality being healthy for all segments of the human population. She asked if that included people with asthma and allergies. Ms. Beam said that it does. In a related question, Chairman Hinman asked about policy NE-113B, trying to determine if a segment of the population was indicated there. Ms. Beam noted that this is not just about health problems, but affordability issues, too. She pointed out that along Avondale Road, for example, there are many apartment buildings dealing with car exhaust and greenhouse gas emissions due to traffic congestion. This area would have poorer air quality in relation to other areas, and happens to be an area with lower socio-economic status. Ms. Beam noted there was a social equity element to this discussion. Chairman Hinman asked Ms. Beam to revise the language in that area. Commissioner Flynn asked about policy NE-114B and was struck by the statement, which is a good philosophy but not a precise, specific policy. To him, this section appears odd in this area, but might fit better in the narrative above. Ms. Beam agreed to make that change.

Chairman Hinman asked about a section above NE-113A, which notes that Redmond is a local government, but one that can have impact regionally and nationally. He asked why this would be in the Comprehensive Plan, and if it would not be more modest to take out the word *nationally*. Ms. Beam noted that the Obama Blueprint talks about the local jurisdictions making change on a national level. The Commission agreed to leave in “nationally”.

Commissioner O’Hara asked about the phrase *the world’s leading atmospheric sciences* as an argument for climate change; he suggested using *some of the science makes that argument*, as this is a controversial topic. Ms. Beam agreed that change could happen. *Scientists know with virtual certainty* is another phrase he believes is political, not scientific. Commissioner Chandorkar asked if the phrase *it is generally accepted* could be used to cover this issue. Commissioner O’Hara said it is not generally accepted. Ms. Beam noted this language is from the EPA, and she will refine the language used.

Commissioner Julinsey asked about a policy between NE-121 and NE-122 talking about minimizing lights, referring to *cultural expression*. Ms. Beam noted that this referred to lighting used as art, and pointed out that ambient light needs to be managed. In some cases, there will be some light necessary for public safety or artistic expression that cannot be removed. The idea is to balance out the lighting.

Commissioner Flynn spoke next to policy NE-33A, a wellhead protection program. Ms. Beam said this policy currently exists in the Land Use Element in the Comprehensive Plan. It was moved over into the Natural Environment Element. Commissioner Flynn said the protection program appears to be the result of policy that the City already has. He said that this appears to be the cart before the horse, and that the elements of the wellhead protection program that are policy should be placed in this section. Ms. Beam said that the wellhead protection program is

like the water conservation program and a stream restoration program. Through implementation of those programs, the City may determine some policies need to be modified and reflected in the Comprehensive Plan. She said that is why recommendations from the wellhead protection program are mentioned here, to indicate that this is a dynamic program that creates new information on what works, and what has not.

Commissioner Flynn wanted to see if some stronger policy language could be used to indicate the City is trying to protect its drinking water, and trying to encourage businesses to use best management practices for source control of their water. This could create a policy, and then lead to a description of what the plan could look like. Commissioner Chandorkar asked if the wellhead protection program could go into the narrative, and the policy could refer to that. Ms. Beam will take a look at this issue and try to make some changes. Commissioner Flynn recommended finding some City ordinance language that could help make this section a stronger policy document.

Chairman Hinman spoke about how, in the initial overview of this element, there is a discussion of water, but he noted there may be other aspects of natural environment that may be added, such as air quality. The Commission had no further comments or suggestions. Ms. Beam said she had enough information to proceed and create an issues matrix.

REPORTS/SCHEDULING/TOPICS FOR NEXT MEETING(S)

Ms. Stiteler noted that she had sent out an email about the summer schedule and the date confirmed for the City Council and Planning Commission joint meeting, September 27th. This will involve a discussion of Package 2 and possible other reconciliation items. Chairman Hinman urged the Commission members to help with this logistic effort by staff. There are holiday dates on September 7th and 14th surrounding Labor Day, as the calendar stands now. Ms. Stiteler noted that Derby Days is the weekend after the Fourth of July and the Planning Commission may be interested in participating similar to last year. Ms. Stiteler mentioned that the Package 1 amendments were passed by the City Council at their June 21st meeting. There was one amendment to that, which passed four votes to three, which spoke to more aggressive language on annexation policy.

ADJOURN

Chairman Hinman adjourned the meeting at approximately 9:43 p.m.

Minutes Approved On:

Planning Commission Chair