	Issue/Commissioner	Policy/Section	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
Capital Facilities	1. Would help to more explicitly note role of maintenance in facility planning and budgeting. (Flynn)	Consider expanding narrative in *Future Vision* (pg 1); *Introduction* (pg 2)	<u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> **8/10/11** The suggestion to insert "facility maintenance costs" will be incorporated in the final Planning Commission-recommended amendments. **7/27/11** Further edits in support of Commissioner feedback are proposed on pages 1, 2, and 10, and appear as highlighted text. **7/20/11** The importance of maintaining capital facilities is critical to achieving service standards, and incorporating these activities in the Capital Facility Program promotes efficient budgeting. Amendments to both Capital Facilities and Utilities elements support this effort in policy and narrative. Staff will look for further opportunities to amend the Capital Facilities element to reflect Commissioner suggestions. <u>Public Comment:</u> <u>PC Comments:</u> **7/27/11** Staff-proposed edits are satisfactory. For clarity, consider adding "facility maintenance costs" immediately following the word "ensuring" in the last paragraph of page 1. **7/20/11** Staff's intended approach is satisfactory. Issue closure pending Planning Commission receipt of proposed text amendment.	Opened 7/13/11 Closed 7/27/11

	Issue/Commissioner	Policy/Section	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
Capital Facilities	2. The phrase "wise use" is unclear. Consider alternative sentence construction. (Biethen)	Proposed policy CF-7 (pg 17), 3rd bullet	<u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> **7/27/11** Staff proposes the following modification to proposed policy CF-7, 3rd bullet, page 17: *Help the City leverage capital investments and ensure ~~wise~~ <u>effective</u> use of public funds.* **7/20/11** Staff will provide alternative wording. <u>Public Comment:</u> <u>PC Comments:</u> **7/20/11** The proposed text change is satisfactory.	Opened 7/13/11 Closed 7/20/11

	Issue/Commissioner	Policy/Section	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
Capital Facilities	3. If the police sub-station at Redmond Town Center is now closed, remove or revise proposed text referring to this facility. (Hinman)	*Police Facilities* (pg 6)	<u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> **7/27/11** Aside from small office spaces Police utilizes at various fire stations and at Microsoft's security office, the department has no other current or planned capital facilities to include in the inventory on page 6. Recommendation is to omit the sentence referring to a police station at Redmond Town Center. Police is not exploring other locations at RTC as those operations have been consolidated into facilities at the main municipal campus. **7/20/11** The sub-station did close recently, so the sentence should be modified. Staff will inquire with Police Department to determine whether a new location within RTC is being considered, and will modify the passage accordingly. <u>Public Comment:</u> <u>PC Comments:</u> **7/27/11** Staff's response is satisfactory. **7/20/11** Staff's intended approach is satisfactory. Issue closure pending Planning Commission receipt of proposed text amendment.	Opened 7/13/11 Closed 7/27/11

	Issue/Commissioner	Policy/Section	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
Capital Facilities	4. Describe location and service arrangements for water facilities jointly owned with Bellevue and Kirkland. (Hinman)	*Water Facilities* (pg 9)	Staff Comment/Recommendation: **7/27/11** The description on page 9 refers to jointly-owned water tanks and pump stations at two locations. Along 152nd, two reservoirs (known as the 'Rose Hill Tanks') and a pump station are jointly used with the City of Kirkland. Conveyance lines for the respective service areas are diverted near the base of the tank. A similar arrangement is held for one tank and pump station with the City of Bellevue, near 148th Ave and 40th St. In these instances the City owns less than half of the facility, so the other jurisdiction coordinates facility maintenance and 'back-bills' Redmond for its portion. **7/20/11** Will consult with Public Works staff and provide information as part of the July 20 Planning Commission meeting. Public Comment: PC Comments: **7/20/11** Response is satisfactory.	Opened 7/13/11 Closed 7/20/11

	Issue/Commissioner	Policy/Section	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
Capital Facilities	5. How does emergency management coincide with the element? (Hinman)	N/A	Staff Comment/Recommendation: **7/20/11** Emergency Management does relate to both the Capital Facilities and Utilities Elements, as City personnel and facilities highlighted in those elements are also involved in emergency management planning and operations. Two City documents speak more directly to emergency management planning and operations: *City of Redmond Hazard Mitigation Plan, Updated 2009.* *Focuses on long-term improvement and protection of the built and natural environments, infrastructure, communication networks and the livelihood of the City of Redmond. Strives to reduce financial impacts resulting from hazards, and increase City's ability to withstand and respond to such events.* *All-Hazards Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan. Office of Emergency Management., Updated 2009.* *One of a family of plans published by the City of Redmond and Redmond Fire Department. It is a framework for citywide mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery activities. Intent is to provide structure for standardizing plans citywide and to facilitate interoperability between local, state, and federal governments.* *The Plan is also compatible with King County's Regional Disaster Plan, the State of Washington Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan, the National Response Framework, and Revised Code of Washington, Chapter 38.52. Format aligns with the State of Washington Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan.* Public Comment: PC Comments: **7/20/11** Response is satisfactory.	Opened 7/13/11 Closed 7/20/11

	Issue/Commissioner	Policy/Section	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
Capital Facilities	6. Service standards should be presented more consistently. (Chandorkar)	Section B, *Level of Service Standards sub-section*	<u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> **8/10/11** Staff will remove the diagram and edit text accordingly. **7/27/11** Staff proposes the following language, which describes the target for the mobility-based transportation service standard. The text below and a companion diagram have been inserted immediately following description of the transportation service standard on page 15. *The target threshold for Redmond's mobility-based transportation service standard is qualitative. The standard strives for a condition where enhancement of the transportation system occurs concurrently, proportionately, and in parallel with City growth, and in a manner consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. This arrangement meets state requirements for establishing service standards.* *In addition, the mobility-based service standard is designed to have the effect of expanding travel choices and achieving a multimodal travel environment. Programs, projects and services in response to existing and growth-related travel include those that improve access and connections, including motor vehicle operations, transit service levels, the walking and bicycling environment and transportation demand management.* **7/20/11** The intent of service standards is similar across all functional areas – to specify a target for service provision. However, the source and methodology of formulating these standards does differ across the City's functional areas, resulting in variations in how the information is presented. For this reason, staff has proposed the section be retitled, Service Standards (currently it is Level of Service Standards), to avoid confusion with industry-specific methodologies and the City's former practices, especially with respect to Transportation service standards (e.g. "LOS").	Opened 7/13/11 Closed 7/27/11

	Issue/Commissioner	Policy/Section	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
Capital Facilities			Furthermore, service standards as provided in the Capital Facilities Element is intended to be a snapshot reference, and readers are encouraged to refer to associated functional plans as noted in Section F: Capital Planning References. Despite the range of presentation styles noted above, one way to ensure service standards read consistently in the Capital Facilities Element is to ensure the service target is explicitly described, either qualitatively or quantitatively. Staff re-reviewed this section with Commission feedback in mind, and notes that proposed amendments to the Transportation sub-section are lacking threshold information, possibly making it out of sync with the remainder of the section. Initially, staff re-wrote the sub-section with the intent of describing how the City utilizes a mobility-based system for ensuring transportation concurrency, then referring the reader to the Transportation Master Plan for further information. Based on Commission feedback, staff will further refine to include baseline thresholds of the newer mobility-based system in an effort to better align this sub-section with the section as a whole. <u>Public Comment:</u> <u>PC Comments:</u> **7/27/11** Staff response and the additional language inserted on page 15 is helpful, however, the diagram that follows is complicated and not helpful. Remove the diagram and edit references in the text above it. **7/20/11** Staff's intended approach is satisfactory. Issue closure pending Planning Commission receipt of proposed text amendment.	

	Issue/Commissioner	Policy/Section	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
Capital Facilities	7. Public-private partnerships (Public Comment)	Part D, *Redmond's Revenue Sources*	Staff Comment/Recommendation: **7/27/11** The suggestion via public comment is consistent with current practices, and in the future the City will continue to consider alternative budgeting options as appropriate. Staff recommends incorporating the suggestion into Part D of the element (page 21) by inserting additional language as presented below. *Many opportunities arise for the City to obtain funding for capital facilities from outside sources, such as State and federal grants. Securing these outside funding sources usually requires supplying some local matching funds. Using local funds as a match to grant funds, as opposed to using local funds as the sole source of funding of projects, allows the City to more efficiently leverage its financial resources. In addition, other financing strategies are available to the City to further support the capital program. Presenting these options in tandem with capital plans allows decision-makers and the public to consider implications of alternative financing.* *CF-15:* *Aggressively pursue funding from other levels of government, non-profit, and private agencies to accomplish the City of Redmond's capital investment program while optimizing use of City resources. As appropriate, pursue alternative financing strategies such as public-private partnerships to further support the capital program.* Public Comment: **7/20/11** Include an express allowance and encouragement of public-private partnerships to finance and construct capital facilities when appropriate and agreed to by all parties PC Comments **7/27/11** Staff response is satisfactory. Issue closed, however the Commission will consider additional public testimony if provided though none was.	Opened 7/13/11 Closed 7/27/11

	Issue/Commissioner	Policy/Section	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
Utilities	8. Utility undergrounding (Staff-proposed discussion issue)	UT-14, 15	Staff Comment/Recommendation: **8/10/11 -** As staff described at Planning Commission's July 27 meeting, the Technical Committee changed its recommendation from Alternative #1 to Alternative #3 following additional review and discussions with the City Attorney. Reasons for the change are as follows: • Anticipated difficulty meeting 5-year timeline for expenditures per state law • Anticipated difficulty aligning CIP projects in areas where funds are collected • Calculating the amount to be contributed to fund adds complexity • Low utilization of a relatively complex program - overall coordination required to successfully integrate the fund-based approach is high, however the likely number of instances triggering the program would be low The Technical Committee's recommendation is to maintain incremental undergrounding of utility distribution lines, but increase allowed exemptions and routinely review short plats through the Technical Committee. Under this approach, new single family homes and alterations to single family homes would only be required to bury service lines on site and to the utility pole. Included with this issue matrix (See last page – Attachment A) is a chart showing potential applicability of Alternative #3 to various development types. In response to public comments #3 and #4, Alternative #3 directs the Technical Committee to review applicability concerning short plats on a case by case basis. This arrangement is preferable due to the variety of means by which utility distribution lines can be configured, depending on number and configuration of lots, among other factors. Staff will reflect the Planning Commission's direction from July 27 regarding the Commission's report.	Opened 7/20/11

	Issue/Commissioner	Policy/Section	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
			7/27/11 During the meeting on 7/20/11 staff summarized the issue as presented in the memo, and noted that staff's preliminary preferred recommendation as cited above had evolved per recent discussions with the Technical Committee and City Attorney. Staff noted aspects of Alternative #1 which may change per further research and discussion with the City Attorney, particularly aspects concerning affected land use actions; exemptions; petitions for relief; anticipated development requirements and costs; and project prioritization and timelines for the City's undergrounding program. Regarding public comment, staff does not recommend the policy change to limit to the project site. Due to the location of utility poles, inclusion of adjacent property may be necessary. **7/20/11** Staff provided a memo in the Commission's 7/15/11 packet which summarized the issue and identified a preliminary, preferred recommendation for implementing policies UT-14 and UT-15. Staff's preliminary, preferred recommendation as presented in the above-referenced memo, as Alternative #1, which would adopt a corridor approach where single family property owners contribute a pre-determined amount toward funding a future City project that undergrounds frontage utilities along an entire corridor, as opposed to the current incremental effort that undergrounds spans one parcel at a time.	

	Issue/Commissioner	Policy/Section	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
			Public Comment #1, 7/20/11 Objects to condition placed on an already-approved project that required undergrounding of distribution lines along frontage (West Lake Sammamish Pkwy), as City had already planned to perform work as part of future road widening. Does not oppose undergrounding of utilities per se, but requests expanded cost-sharing, as the condition resulted in high costs for the property owner. Public Comment #2, 7/20/11 Suggests amendments to Policy UT-15 which would limit applicability of UT-15 to the project site. Public Comment #3, 7/27/11 Recommends that proposed revisions to zoning code also apply to small short plats where the likelihood of additional development in the immediate area/neighborhood is unlikely. Public Comment #4, 7/28/11 Comment reiterates #3. Requests exemptions for minor short plats. PC Comments: **7/27/11** The Planning Commission supports the Technical Committee's revised recommendation. The Commission would like the final Report to include the following recommendations for eventual code development: • Further guidance for short plats and explanation of Technical Committee review process • Clarification regarding applicability of development types, as the categories are fairly broad as shown **7/20/11** The Commission asked several questions relating to staff's memo and public testimony. At this time the Planning Commission recommends pursuing Alternative 1, realizing refinements in areas noted in staff's response (as shown above) will be needed per further research and consultation with City attorney.	

	Issue/Commissioner	Policy/Section	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
Utilities	9. Retrofitting existing development with current stormwater controls (Public comment)	Various policies and narrative in the stormwater section.	Staff Comment/Recommendation: **8/10/11** Per public comment #4 and ensuing Planning Commission discussion: The issue table is a working document, meant to enhance communications between Commissioners and staff via centralized issue tracking. However, staff recognizes the issue table also provides background related to policy development, and as a public document it is prudent to be as clear as possible in describing this context. Staff therefore revises the statement of concern as shown below, and as shown under the 7/27/11 entry: "…ensuring that property owners in violation of pollution control regulations are brought into compliance ~~meet current standards~~ are two ways to further this effort." **7/27/11** In response to public comment, the intent of narrative and policies associated with public comment was not to suggest that the City may mandate stormwater system upgrades to private property owners without cause. The City does intend for future private and public development to meet current stormwater standards, including evaluation of green infrastructure techniques with implementation as appropriate. In addition, narrative in the opening of the stormwater section is intended in part to point out that much of Redmond was developed long before adoption of current stormwater regulations, and the resultant extent of impervious surfaces without contemporary stormwater controls is significant. Appropriately reconciling this condition is a major step the City can take toward meeting its environmental goals. Retrofitting developed areas via City capital projects – which can improve the management of stormwater on both public and private property – and ensuring that property owners in violation of pollution control regulations are brought into compliance ~~meet current standards~~ [see 8/10/11 note] are two ways to further this effort. Narrative on page 13 and Policy New 4 have been revised to clarify the City's intent per feedback received in public comment.	Opened 7/20 and closed 8/10/11

	Issue/Commissioner	Policy/Section	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
			Public Comment #1, 7/20/11 Proposed policy modifications to clarify applicability in urban centers and conditions for when green infrastructure techniques need to be implemented. Public Comment #2, 7/20/11 Interprets proposed changes to narrative and policies in the stormwater section as exacting mitigation on private property owners without cause. Requests refinements to clarify City's intent. Public Comment #3, 7/20/11 Comments were similar to, and reinforced Public Comment #2, and the commenter provided additional language modification. Public Comment #4, 7/27/11 Amendments to Utilities Element in response to public comments on this issue are satisfactory. However the sentence in the 7/27/11 staff response [see above] that refers to ensuring property owners in violation of pollution control regulations meet current standards is troubling, as it implies mandated upgrades beyond that which would be needed to comply with pollution control. Request revised language for clarity. PC Comments: The Commission is satisfied with staff's amendments to the Utilities Element in response to public comments. The Commission also discussed concern over staff's response in the issue matrix per Public Comment #4. Commissioners expressed various viewpoints as to whether an issue matrix revision was warranted, given that the commenter and Commission found the element itself to be satisfactory. Staff recognized the points made on all sides of this discussion, but felt that in this instance a change to the issue matrix for clarity would remain consistent with initial intended position, and therefore the request from public comment could be accommodated without difficulty. The matrix has been revised within the 7/27/11 entry, with context noted under the 8/10/11 entry.	

	Issue/Commissioner	Policy/Section	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
Utilities	10. Green infrastructure evaluation and implementation in relation to urban center development objectives	UT-43; NEW 6	<u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> **7/27/11** While urban centers are locations of greater development intensities, the City also wishes to encourage use of development techniques that both optimize development potential and improve environmental quality Citywide, such as by reducing impervious areas or utilizing green infrastructure techniques. The appropriate technique depends in part on the location. An evaluation of green infrastructure techniques should form a basis to identify suitable techniques, but avoiding these methods strictly based on economic feasibility is not consistent with direction from the Department of Ecology via NPDES municipal stormwater permit requirements. Policy New 2 and UT-43 have been revised to better reflect the above intent, based on feedback from public comment. <u>Public Comment #1, 7/20/11</u> Minimizing impervious surface area is contrary to urban center development objectives; and, implementation of green infrastructure site planning techniques should be limited to economically-feasible scenarios. <u>PC Comments:</u> **7/27/11** Staff response is satisfactory.	Opened 7/20/11 Closed, Pend-ing further public comm-ent 7/27/11

	Issue/Commissioner	Policy/Section	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
Utilities	11. Coordination with energy service providers	UT-58; New 12	Staff Comment/Recommendation: **7/27/11** The City recognizes the importance of coordinating with energy providers, and worked closely with Puget Sound Energy representatives in developing the new Energy section (Utilities Element new section F) and associated policies. Moreover, existing policies do speak to the importance of coordinating with energy providers for land use planning purposes. Existing policy UT-57 (proposed amendments show this policy re-numbered to UT-58) is an example. Staff has proposed changes to this policy for clarification, per coordination with Puget Sound Energy and consistency with the new Energy section's format and content. In addition to existing policy statements noted above, staff also modified policy NEW 12 to refer to coordination with energy providers and promote a reliable energy supply. Public Comment #1, 7/20/11 There is a gap in the Comprehensive Plan that does not address how the City of Redmond and Puget Sound Energy will collaborate together to achieve the goals the City of Redmond has in its Comprehensive Plan, or to work in partnership on power reliability, delivery or future innovations. PC Comments: **7/27/11** Staff response is satisfactory	Opened 7/20 Closed, Pend-ing further public comm-ent 7/27/11

	Issue/Commissioner	Policy/Section	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	12. Breadth of new policies in Energy section	Energy section; Policies New 15-21	Staff Comment/Recommendation: **8/10/11** Staff recommends maintaining the policies as proposed with the recognition that it is in the interests of all parties that the policies can be feasibly implemented. **7/27/11** Incorporating energy conversation policies into the Comprehensive Plan update has been a significant, planned suite of amendments for the 2010-2011 Comprehensive Plan update. Policies were developed with guidance from Puget Sound Regional Council and are consistent with Puget Sound Energy objectives. Staff will consider improvements for clarity, but more information is needed before further modifications can be considered. Public Comment #1, 7/20/11 Policies New 15-21, though laudable, are overly broad and need clarification. Could result in regulations that are impractical or economically infeasible. Public Comment #2, 8/3/11 As drafted, various energy efficiency policies have significant implementation challenges without further specificity on intent, implementation flexibilities and alternatives. Comprehensive Plan policies should articulate goals and outcomes that recognize cost/benefits and economic and environmental paybacks. Ultimately we can agree on outcomes if there is flexibility on how to attain them. PC Comments: **8/10/11:** Because the policies do not specify mandates, or preclude specific development activities, the Planning Commission was not compelled to make further changes. The Commission expressed interest in inviting further coordination with the public at the implementation stage, such as Zoning Code development or development of a with a climate action plan. **7/27/11**: Issue will remain open, as additional information is needed per staff response to public comment #1.	Opened 7/20/11 Closed 8/10/11

	Issue/Commissioner	Policy/Section	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	13. Energy audits when buildings transfer ownership (Flynn)	Energy section, Policy New 19	<u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> **7/27/11** Staff revised the policy to clarify purpose, and to cite energy audits as one of several options for improving building performance and protecting potential buyers. The re-written policy reads: *Promote increased awareness of commercial and multi-family buildings' energy consumption to inform real estate transactions and improve the energy efficiency of Redmond's building stock over time. Consider using techniques such as energy audits or disclosure of energy usage when buildings transfer ownership.* <u>Public Comment</u> <u>PC Comments:</u> **8/10/11** The Commission is satisfied with staff's response. **7/20/11** Requiring energy audits at time of building transfer of ownership seems like a market function, and may not be suitable as policy.	Opened 7/20/11 Closed 7/27/11

	Issue/Commissioner	Policy/Section	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	14. Suggested edits to overall Energy section (Hinman)	Energy section - all	Staff Comment/Recommendation: **8/10/11** Environmental planning staff have reviewed, and support, Commissioner Hinman's edits with the exception of UT-62 per below. **7/27/11** The proposal is consistent with staff's recommendation, however recommend keeping policy UT-62 as-is, to ensure all electrical facilities are captures within the policy. Public Comment PC Comments: [Note: Commissioner Hinman provided suggested edits to the Energy section in writing. That document was distributed to the full Commission for consideration] **7/27/11** Other Commissioners were in support of Commissioner Hinman's proposed edits, and concur with staff's recommendation regarding UT-62 per above.	Opened 7/27/11 Closed 7/27/11

	Issue/Commissioner	Policy/Section	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	15. Clarify the portion of Policy CF-17 in the Capital Facilities Element that calls for a strategy for achieving consistency between the land use vision and the school district facility plan beyond six years.	5th bullet of Policy CF-17 (existing Policy CF-18); page 22	Staff Comment/Recommendation: **8/10/11** Staff proposes removal of the 5th bullet, which would not negatively impact the policy as a whole. Public Comment During development of the staff-recommended Capital Facilities Element, Lake Washington School District staff inquired as to how the companion bullets to CF-17 are interpreted and implemented. Staff has reviewed the Lake Washington School District Six Year Capital Facility Plan, 2011-2016 (Adopted by School District Board May 16, 2011) and finds that the facility plan generally complies with CF-17. However, for purposes of clarifying policy CF-17, staff finds the 5th bullet is unclear and recommends removal. PC Comments: The Commission supported this change.	Opened and closed 8/10/11

Attachment A: Alternative #3 – Utility undergrounding land use applicability and requirements

	Land use	No utilities present	Aerial utilities present
1	• New plats • New multifamily • New commercial • New industrial • Alterations to any of the above	Per existing code	Per existing code
2	Short plats	Technical Committee discretion to determine applicability Could be based on: • # of lots • existing utility configuration • scope of proposal	Same as if no utilities present (see box to left)
3	• New SFR • Full demolition • Alterations exceeding 100% value	• Exempt from frontage requirements/distribution lines • Responsible for burying service lines on site and to distribution pole	• Exempt from frontage requirements/distribution lines • Responsible for burying service lines on site