

	Issue/Commissioner	Policy/Section	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
Capital Facilities	<p>1. Would help to more explicitly note role of maintenance in facility planning and budgeting.</p> <p>(Flynn)</p>	<p>Consider expanding narrative in <i>Future Vision</i> (pg 1); <i>Introduction</i> (pg 2)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> The importance of maintaining capital facilities is critical to achieving service standards, and incorporating these activities in the Capital Facility Program promotes efficient budgeting.</p> <p>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.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u></p>	<p>Opened 7/13/11</p>
Capital Facilities	<p>2. The phrase “wise use” is unclear. Consider alternative sentence construction.</p> <p>(Biethen)</p>	<p>CF-8 (pg 17), 3rd bullet</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> Staff will provide alternative wording.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u></p>	<p>Opened 7/13/11</p>
Capital Facilities	<p>3. If the police sub-station at Redmond Town Center is now closed, remove or revise proposed text referring to this facility.</p> <p>(Hinman)</p>	<p><i>Police Facilities</i> (pg 6)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> The sub-station did close recently, so the sentence should be modified. Staff will inquire with Police to determine whether a new location within RTC is being considered, and will modify the passage accordingly.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u></p>	<p>Opened 7/13/11</p>

	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)	<i>Water Facilities</i> (pg 9)	<u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> Will consult with Public Works staff and provide information as part of the July 20 Planning Commission meeting. <u>Public Comment:</u> <u>PC Comments:</u>	Opened 7/13/11

	Issue/Commissioner	Policy/Section	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
Capital Facilities	5. How does emergency management coincide with the element? (Hinman)	N/A	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> 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:</p> <p><u>City of Redmond Hazard Mitigation Plan, Updated 2009.</u></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><u>All-Hazards Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan. Office of Emergency Management., Updated 2009.</u></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u></p>	Opened 7/13/11

	Issue/Commissioner	Policy/Section	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
Capital Facilities	6. Service standards should be presented more consistently. (Chandorkar)	Section B, <i>Level of Service Standards sub-section</i>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> 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, <i>Service Standards</i> (currently it is <i>Level of Service Standards</i>), to avoid confusion with industry-specific methodologies and the City’s former practices, especially with respect to Transportation service standards (e.g. “LOS”). 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 <i>Section F: Capital Planning References</i>.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u></p>	Opened 7/13/11