

Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
<p>1. Suggestion to use the term “iconic” in relation to art.</p> <p>(Hinman)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> 7/21/11: Parks & Recreation Director and Arts Administrator discussed, and preferred to not include this in a Comprehensive Plan policy.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u> 7/18/11: Commissioner indicated that the term “iconic” might be added to a policy on art. 7/27/11: The Commission was satisfied with the staff response.</p>	<p>Opened 7/18/11*</p> <p>Closed 7/27/11</p>
<p>2. Clarify that 2030 park needs are in addition to existing park land. Include the percentage increase this would be.</p> <p>(O’Hara)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> 7/20/11: Text, with suggested revision is:</p> <p>Based on the level of service standards, the City’s projected 2030 needs include 28 acres of <u>additional</u> neighborhood park property and more than 32 miles of <u>additional</u> trails. <u>This is a 29% increase in neighborhood parks, and a 55% increase in trail mileage.</u></p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u> 7/18/11: Planning Commissioners requested information to clarify the projected park land needs for 2030. 7/27/11: The Commission was satisfied with the staff response</p>	<p>Opened 7/18/11</p> <p>Closed 7/27/11 <i>With changes incorporated</i></p>
<p>3. Add the concept of protecting wildlife habitat as one of the policy goals in the Acquisition and Funding section.</p> <p>(O’Hara)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> 7/20/11: The policy language will be revised to:</p> <p>PR 5/58: Encourage the acquisition of resource park land to protect environmental resources; represent significant natural and visual assets; provide circulation linkages, wildlife corridors, <i>and habitat</i>; and ensure adequate separation and buffers between various land uses.</p>	<p>Opened 7/18/11</p> <p>Closed 7/27/11 <i>With changes incorporated</i></p>

	<p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u> <u>7/18/11:</u> Planning Commissioner wanted a more comprehensive approach to acquisition of resource park land, to include wildlife habitat. <u>7/27/11:</u> The Commission was satisfied with the staff response</p>	
<p>4. Clarify meaning of text related to partnering with other organizations “to provide programming and events consistent with the values of the City.”</p> <p>(O’Hara)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> <u>7/20/11:</u> Text will be revised to:</p> <p>PR-NEW7: Partner with businesses and community organizations to provide programming and events that <i>further the vision expressed in the Comprehensive Plan.</i></p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u> <u>7/18/11:</u> The Planning Commission indicated that text should relate to the vision as expressed in the PARCC Element. <u>7/27/11:</u> The Commission was satisfied with the staff response</p>	<p>Opened 7/18/11</p> <p>Closed 7/27/11 <i>With changes incorporated</i></p>
<p>5. Two policies related to historic properties seem to be covering the same issues.</p> <p>(O’Hara)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> <u>7/20/11:</u> Policy PR-NEW8 will be revised to clarify that PR-37 is about the preservation of recreation facilities, and PR-NEW8 is about recreation programs.</p> <p>PR-NEW8 <i>Provide educational and hands-on recreational opportunities that explore the history of Redmond through historic parks, farms, structures and artifacts.</i></p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u> <u>7/18/11:</u> Planning Commissioner observed that on first review two policies</p>	<p>Opened 7/18/11</p> <p>Closed 7/27/11 <i>With changes incorporated</i></p>

	<p>related to historic properties seem redundant and suggested review. <u>7/27/11</u>: The Commission was satisfied with the staff response</p>	
<p>6. Clarify by giving an example of the two policies that refer to King County properties. <i>(O’Hara)</i></p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> <u>7/20/11</u>: Acquiring Marymoor Park could be one outcome of PR-72, but it could also include acquisition of other County park land. This would give the City the ability to better integrate the parks into the fabric of the City, and remove barriers to creating a more comprehensive approach to parks within the City. PR-37 is intended to simplify the permitting process required to develop park land that is outside the City limits. <u>8/10/11</u>: Parks staff proposes new language for PR-72 as follows: PR-72 Develop a long-term strategy with King County to <i>enhance opportunities for the City to develop facilities or utilize county parks within or adjacent to the City of Redmond.</i> <u>Public Comment:</u> <u>PC Comments:</u> <u>7/18/11</u>: Planning Commissioner asked for information on how these policies might be enacted. <u>7/27/11</u>: The Commission asked for more context.</p>	<p>Opened 7/18/11 More Context Needed 7/27/11 Closed 8/10/11 <i>With changes incorporated</i></p>
<p>7. Review how the PSE Trail is described. <i>(Hinman)</i></p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> <u>7/20/11</u>: Section D. Coordination refers to working with other organizations and agencies “for the acquisition, planning, development, use, and programming of the PARCC system...” While no agencies or sites are singled out in this policy, the PSE Trail is one of the facilities that the City does actively coordinate with another agency on. The text in Section G. Trails will be modified as follows: “...Most trails are City owned and maintained; however the Sammamish River Trail is owned and maintained by King County and the SR 520 Bikeway is owned and maintained by the Washington State Department of Transportation. <i>The Redmond/PSE Trail is owned by PSE and the City and</i></p>	<p>Opened 7/20/11 Closed 7/27/11 <i>With changes incorporated</i></p>

	<p><i>maintained by the City.”</i></p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u> <u>7/20/11:</u> Planning Commissioner asked for information concerning references to the PSE Trail in the PARCC Element. <u>7/27/11:</u> The Commission was satisfied with the staff response</p>	
<p>8. Is interpretive signage addressed in the PARCC Element? (Chandorkar)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> <u>7/20/11:</u> PR-28 covers interpretive signage, which is intended for appropriate natural settings: “Develop facilities and acquire land for environmental education, including a Citywide interpretive sign program for shorelines, streams, native growth areas....” This policy encourages interpretive signage throughout the City. Staff does not recommend amending the policy to operate at a neighborhood level. Practically, the future realignment of Evans Creek and trail development in the Bear Creek neighborhood will likely include interpretive signage.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u> <u>7/20/11:</u> Planning Commissioner shared that the Bear Creek Neighborhood Citizen Advisory Committee requested interpretive signage in the resource park areas, to draw attention to the wealth of migratory birds, habitat and other natural features. <u>7/27/11:</u> The Commission was satisfied with the staff response</p>	<p>Opened 7/20/11 Closed 7/27/11</p>
<p>9. Are there specifications for maintenance practices in</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> <u>7/20/11:</u> This level of detail is reserved for operational procedures prepared by</p>	<p>Opened 7/20/11</p>

<p>the PARCC Element? <i>(Chandorkar, Sustainable Redmond)</i></p>	<p>the Park Operations staff, including the Integrated Pest Management Plan. Policy references that guide staff include PR-NEW2 that references sustainability and protection of natural areas, and PR-66/67 refers to managing open space using sustainable management practices.</p> <p>8/10/11: The City proposes the following more general policy language to address Sustainable Redmond’s concerns. A stated above, policies should provide guidance, and technical details are described either in functional plans or operational procedures.</p> <p>PR-NEW2: Encourage conservation and sustainability throughout the Redmond parks and recreation system by preservation of significant natural areas, protection <i>of health and</i> natural resources, and sustainable design, construction, <i>renovation and maintenance of</i> facilities.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u> <u>8/3/11</u> Sustainable Redmond proposed the following changes (underlined) and provided the rationale below:</p> <p><i>Encourage conservation and sustainability throughout the Redmond parks and recreation system by preservation of significant natural areas, protection of <u>health and</u> natural resources <u>without the use of synthetic pesticides and fertilizers</u>, and sustainable design and construction of new and renovated facilities.</i></p> <p>“It is important to preserve the health of the natural environment in order to protect the wildlife, water quality in our streams lakes, as well as the community’s health. Currently the City of Seattle and Shoreline have adopted programs to reduce and/or eliminate pesticide use in parks. We recommend the City of Redmond implement the same practices as well.”</p>	<p>Closed 7/27/11</p> <p>Reopened 8/3/11 due to receipt of public comment that the Planning Commission has not reviewed.</p> <p>Closed 8/10/11 <i>With changes incorporated</i></p>
--	---	--

	<p><u>PC Comments:</u> <u>7/20/11:</u> Planning Commissioner asked for information concerning whether horticultural maintenance practices using materials such as fertilizer or compost are addressed in the PARCC Element.</p> <p><u>7/27/11:</u> The Commission was satisfied with the staff response.</p> <p><u>8/10/11:</u> The Commission was satisfied with the staff response to public comment.</p>	
<p>10. Is there a policy related to a feasibility study or siting of an arts facility in the Plan? <i>(Flynn)</i></p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> <u>7/20/11:</u> There is not a policy that specifically calls for a siting study. One policy refers to an arts facility, as follows:</p> <p>PR-19: Create a balanced system of recreation opportunities for all ages by providing...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Facilities to support the cultural arts (e.g., program rooms, performing arts theater, and outdoor concert space.) <p>Another policy will be modified to incorporate the need for an arts facility.</p> <p>PR-20: Provide for indoor and outdoor recreation facilities that meet level of service standards such as, but not limited to, meeting rooms, facilities to serve special populations, classrooms, picnic shelters, sports fields, an aquatics facility, <i>an arts facility</i>, and gymnasiums.</p> <p><u>7/27/11:</u> However, the Parks Department proposes to modify the language in PR-20, as italicized above, to have a more broad description of the arts facility, which could cover a range of uses from performances, education, and studio space.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p>	<p>Opened 7/20/11</p> <p>Closed 7/27/11 <i>with modifications from Parks Dept.</i></p>

	<p><u>PC Comments:</u> <u>7/20/11:</u> Planning Commissioner asked whether the PARCC Element has a reference to a siting/feasibility study for a performing arts facility. <u>7/27/11:</u> The Commission was satisfied with the staff response.</p>	
<p>11. Do we have a policy that covers protection of steep slopes and other critical areas, as struck on the bottom of page 5? <i>(Chandorkar)</i></p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> <u>7/27/11:</u> The Parks Dept. recommends deleting the last sentence of this text that follows, because staff did not feel that was a basic function of the department or a prime type of land to acquire for the parks system. This is not to say that the City would not acquire this type of land, but this land can also be preserved in private ownership under the critical area ordinance.</p> <p>“Redmond's park, recreation, arts, and open space system, guided by the policies in the Parks, Arts, Recreation, Culture, and Conservation Element, has the following basic functions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To serve existing and future demand for a variety of park types and a multitude of recreation activities; ▪ To provide recreational programs for the entire community, including all ages, physical capabilities, and cultural backgrounds; ▪ To provide for the cultural needs of the community, by providing facilities used for performing arts and arts exhibits, arts education and programming, and other facilities such as informal gathering places; and • To provide for the conservation of important environmental resources, such as shorelines and wetlands, which might otherwise be lost to development. <p>To preserve areas which are unsuitable for development due to flooding, erosion or other hazards, such as floodplains, or steep slopes.”</p>	<p>Opened 7/27/11 Closed 8/10/11 <i>With changes incorporated</i></p>

	<p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u> <u>7/27/11:</u> Do we have a policy that covers protection of steep slopes and other critical areas, as struck on the bottom of page 5? <u>8/10/11:</u> The Commission was satisfied with the staff response.</p>	
<p>12. Would like to see a policy that encourages installation of Wi-Fi in parks. (Chandorkar)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> <u>7/27/11:</u> The language has been modified to encourage more use of technology in the park system to attract more users, whether it is through advanced lighting systems to allow evening or early morning uses, Wi-Fi or the next generation of our communications system. PR-21/54 Design new and renovated facilities utilizing appropriate <i>construction and maintenance</i> technologies to gain cost efficiencies and conserve resources and <i>integrate technology into park design, as appropriate, to accommodate diverse uses and increase capacity through extended and expanded uses.</i></p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u> <u>7/27/11:</u> Consider adding a policy to encourage the development of Wi-Fi resources in parks <u>8/10/11:</u> The Commission was satisfied with the staff response.</p>	<p>Opened 7/27/11 Closed 8/10/11 <i>With changes incorporated</i></p>
<p>13. PR 21/54 is too confusing (Miller)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> <u>7/27/11:</u> The language has been modified to differentiate how technology can be used to both create construction and operational efficiencies and to encourage more use of the park system. The new language is shown in Item 12, above.</p>	<p>Opened 7/27/11 Closed 8/10/11 <i>With changes incorporated</i></p>

	<p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u> <u>7/27/11:</u> Rewrite PR 21/54, it is confusing</p> <p><u>8/10/11:</u> The Commission was satisfied with the staff response.</p>	
<p>14. PR-22 Editorial <i>(Miller)</i></p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> <u>7/27/11:</u> The policy language will be modified as follows:</p> <p>PR-22 Provide facilities for un-programmed active recreation such as, but not limited to: <i>indoor court or field sports</i>, rollerblading, skateboarding, and bicycling.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u> <u>7/27/11:</u> Gymnasium is not an activity</p> <p><u>8/10/11:</u> The Commission was satisfied with the staff response.</p>	<p>Opened 7/27/11</p> <p>Closed 8/10/11 <i>With changes incorporated</i></p>
<p>15. Terminology of Trails <i>(Miller)</i></p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> Staff does not recommend changing the trail terminology. The City adopted the new trail classification names, definitions and standards in the PARCC Plan in June 2010. The Redmond Central Connector was named so for a number of reasons including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connecting the old and new parts of Downtown, • Developing new multi-modal transportation connections via streets, transit and trails, • Creating interpersonal connections by bringing tens of thousands of people together in the heart of Redmond each month. <p>The rationale for the name does not relate to the trail classification. Even with this difference in the name of the trail and the trail classification, the trail classification is a planning tool that is not typically used by the public. Trails are not named or referred to on way finding signs or park signs with their</p>	<p>Opened 7/27/11</p> <p>Closed 8/10/11</p>

	<p>classification.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u> <u>7/27/11:</u> “Connector Trail” is confusing terminology, especially since the Redmond Central Connector Trail is a regional trail. Consider renaming the classification of connector trails to something else like community trail.</p> <p><u>8/10/11:</u> The Commission was satisfied with the staff response.</p>	
<p>16. Section G Text Editorial (Miller)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> The text in Section G will be modified as follows:</p> <p><i>The Parks and Recreation Department and Transportation Division collaborate on the development of trails throughout the City. The trail network complements the City’s Bicycle System Plan and Pedestrian Plan, which focuses on bicycling and walking as means of transportation. The trail network is a combination of paved and unpaved surfaces and, wherever possible, the trails are separated from streets.</i></p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u> <u>7/27/11:</u> Recommended changes to the text in Section G that is more general, so not to “date” terminology for bicycle facilities. Also there is an editorial recommendation that bicycle lanes are not a means of transportation, but bicycles are.</p> <p><u>8/10/11:</u> The Commission was satisfied with the staff response.</p>	<p>Opened 7/27/11</p> <p>Closed 8/10/11 With changes incorporated</p>
<p>17. PR-44 (Miller)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> The policy will be modified as follows:</p> <p>PR-44 Encourage the development of trails that are separated from</p>	<p>Opened 7/27/11</p> <p>Closed 8/10/11 With changes</p>

	<p>traffic, with an emphasis on safety and minimizing conflicts between various trail users.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u> <u>7/27/11:</u> Delete the word recreational</p> <p><u>8/10/11:</u> The Commission was satisfied with the staff response.</p>	<p><i>incorporated</i></p>
<p>18. Private Parks (Chandorkar)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> The City does not maintain any of the private parks, nor does it contribute money to parks that are not open to the public. The decision to include private parks in the level of service for parks was made during the adoption of the PARCC Plan. This change was made, because City code requires larger developments to provide open space and recreational opportunities to homeowners. Therefore, these areas are serving part of our population and satisfying some of the need, albeit it is usually a small space.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u> <u>7/27/11:</u> Does the City have a program that helps HOAs maintain private parks? Is the City maintaining any private parks? Why are private parks being counted in the level of service if they are not public parks?</p> <p><u>8/10/11:</u> The Commission was satisfied with the staff response.</p>	<p>Opened 7/27/11 Closed 8/10/11</p>

- On 7/18/11 – Staff met with Planning Commission chair, co-chair and issue lead to prepare for the 7/20 meeting.