

**PC ISSUES MATRIX**  
**Limited Shoreline Master Program Amendment**  
(Natural Environment Element/FEMA)

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Discussion Notes</b>	<b><u>Status</u></b>
1. Policy NE-39 (Julinsey)	<p><u>PC Preliminary Direction</u> Please provide a map of contaminated sites in Redmond.</p> <p><u>Staff Recommendation &amp; Reasoning</u> Staff has provided this map. Note that the City does not map contaminated sites outside of the Critical Aquifer Recharge Area.</p> <p>7/13 Update – City Wellhead Protection Program staff is typically notified of spills or contamination by other agencies or city stormwater crews. One staff is notified, the property owner is contacted. Wellhead Protection staff also work with the City’s Spill Response Group. The City decides if anything else beyond immediate clean-up is required. If so, staff works with the property owner to implement these measures. Larger site contamination issues are coordinated through the Department of Ecology. There is a state law requiring property owners to report spills. This information goes into an Ecology environmental response tracking system. The City is then notified and make be requested to further investigate the incident, with Ecology acting as lead. The City’s Municipal Code has a similar provision that requires notification to the City within 24 hours of a spill. In summary, the City typically takes lead for single small incidents, such as car accidents or generator spills, responding and coordinating clean up. Larger complicated contamination sites are coordinated by the Department of Ecology.</p> <p><u>Public Comments</u></p> <p><u>PC Discussion</u> The map is a helpful tool and it should be noted that it shows more than contaminated sites (contaminated sites</p>	6/22 Information Request 6/29 Information Request

Issue	Discussion Notes	<u>Status</u>
	<p>indicated by a red triangle). The Commission asked general questions regarding City procedures for addressing contaminated sites.</p>	
<p>2. Policy NE-68a (Biethan)</p>	<p><u>PC Preliminary Direction</u> What does “where feasible” mean and when would it apply? Add a qualifier.</p> <p><u>Staff Recommendation &amp; Reasoning</u> This policy is a broad statement that the City, as a community, should strive to achieve. We currently require hydrological functions be maintained and restored when development impacts those functions as they pertain to wetlands, stream, or floodplains. The goal is “no net loss”. Restoring them to a more natural state would be encouraged but, aside from degraded stream buffers, is not required. Where feasible can be challenging to define.</p> <p>The policy could be reworded to read, “<i>Maintain natural hydrological functions within the city’s ecosystems and watershed and, <del>where feasible, restore them</del> encourage their restoration to a more natural state.</i>”</p> <p><u>Public Comments</u></p> <p><u>PC Discussion</u> Language addresses the question.</p>	<p>6/29 Closed</p>
<p>3. Policy NE-79 (Hinman)</p>	<p><u>PC Preliminary Direction</u> Please provide a map showing Core Preservation Areas in Redmond.</p> <p><u>Staff Recommendation &amp; Reasoning</u> Staff has provided the Fish and Wildlife habitat Conservation Areas (Core Preservation Areas) map from the CAO map portfolio.</p> <p><u>Public Comments</u></p>	<p>6/29 Closed</p>

Issue	Discussion Notes	<u>Status</u>
	<p><u>PC Discussion</u> Information responds to request.</p>	
<p>4. Policy NE-114b (Flynn)</p>	<p><u>PC Preliminary Direction</u> This policy should be moved into the narrative text for Air Quality since it represents a philosophical achievement.</p> <p><u>Staff Recommendation &amp; Reasoning</u> Staff concurs.</p> <p>This language can be added to the beginning of the Air Quality narrative, <i><u>“Clean outdoor air quality is healthy for all segments of the human population and for the natural environment. It contributes to quality of life. Clean air...”</u></i></p> <p><u>Public Comments</u></p> <p><u>PC Discussion</u> Language addresses request.</p>	<p>6/29 Closed</p>
<p>5. Policy NE-33a (Flynn)</p>	<p><u>PC Preliminary Direction</u> This policy seems a little backwards in that the Wellhead Protection Program should not influence the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code. Instead, the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code should influence the Program.</p> <p><u>Staff Recommendation &amp; Reasoning</u> This policy current exists in the Comprehensive Plan as policy LU-52. It has a slight modification but is basically the same. Staff understands the concern and has proposed eliminating the first sentence of this policy, while keeping the second sentence intact. However, the Commission should be aware it is possible that findings and monitoring associated with the Wellhead Protection Program may cause need to influence city policy and regulations.</p> <p><del>“Incorporate recommendations from the Wellhead Protection</del></p>	<p>7/13 Closed</p>

Issue	Discussion Notes	<u>Status</u>
	<p><del>Program into the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code.</del>  <i>Consider especially whether updates are needed to land use policies, regulations, or development or operating standards that ensure appropriate levels of groundwater recharge and apply to uses involving hazardous materials located in Wellhead Protection Zones 1 and 2.”</i></p> <p>7/13 Update – Staff has modified the policy in response to both the Commission’s desire for it to be more action oriented along with the public comment of balancing it out with infiltration. The policy language recommended is, “<del>Consider especially whether updates are needed to</del> <u>Occasionally review and update land use policies, regulations, or development or operating standards that ensure appropriate levels of groundwater recharge and apply to uses involving hazardous materials located in Wellhead Protection Zones 1 and 2. Any revisions to code or policy to address wellhead protection must be balanced with the desire for infiltration and recharge.</u>”</p> <p>7/20 Update – Staff has modified the language slightly in response to the Commissioners request as well as in response to written testimony. Additionally, the second sentence has been slightly modified to make it action oriented. The policy language recommended is, “<del>Consider especially whether updates are needed to</del> <u>Periodically review and update land use policies, regulations, or development or operating standards that ensure appropriate levels of groundwater recharge and apply to uses involving hazardous materials located in Wellhead Protection Zones 1 and 2. Ensure that any revisions to code or policy to address wellhead protection must be are balanced with the desire for infiltration and recharge.</u>”</p>	

Issue	Discussion Notes	<u>Status</u>
	<p><u>Public Comments</u> Written testimony requests clarifying language be added to address the balance of wellhead protection with the desire for infiltration. It reads, “Any revisions to code or policy to address wellhead protection must be balanced with the desire for infiltration and recharge.”</p> <p><u>PC Discussion</u> Language addresses concern.</p>	
6. Policy NE-52 (Miller, Hinman)	<p><u>PC Preliminary Direction</u> This policy is awkward and should be re-written.</p> <p><u>Staff Recommendation &amp; Reasoning</u> Staff has revised the text.</p> <p><i>“Limit impervious surfaces <del>outside the Downtown and Overlake Urban Centers</del> <u>citywide</u> to reduce the possibility of flooding, to protect the environment, and to allow for groundwater recharge as appropriate for the specific needs of particular neighborhoods and urban centers.”</i></p> <p><u>Public Comments</u></p> <p><u>PC Discussion</u> Language addresses concern.</p>	6/29 Closed
7. Introductory Text (Hinman)	<p><u>PC Preliminary Direction</u> The introductory text should be amended to include air quality.</p> <p><u>Staff Recommendation &amp; Reasoning</u> Staff has revised the text.</p> <p><i>“Redmond in 2030 has maintained a very green character. <u>Citizens benefit from its livability which contributes to the general quality of life.</u> The City is framed within a beautiful natural setting, with open spaces and an abundance of trees continuing to define Redmond’s physical appearance, including forested hillsides that flank the Sammamish Valley, Lake</i></p>	6/29 Closed

Issue	Discussion Notes	<u>Status</u>
	<p><i>Sammamish and Bear Creek. <u>Clean air quality not only contributes to a healthy community, it also helps keep the scenic mountain vistas visible from the city. Likewise, reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and particulate air pollutants enhances these benefits. A system of....</u></i></p> <p><u>Public Comments</u></p> <p><u>PC Discussion</u> Language improves and broadens introductory text.</p>	
<p>8. Climate Change Narrative (O’Hara)</p>	<p><u>PC Preliminary Direction</u> Soften the introductory text so that the City does not make a political statement.</p> <p><u>Staff Recommendation &amp; Reasoning</u> Staff has modified this text.</p> <p><del>“The</del> <i>Some of the world’s leading atmospheric scientists predict that climate change....”</i></p> <p><i>“According to the EPA, careful measurements have confirmed that greenhouse gas emissions are increasing and that human activities are the primary cause. <del>Scientists now with virtual certainty</del> <u>Most scientists believe that....</u>”</i></p> <p>7/20 Update - Staff has modified the text per the request of the Commission.</p> <p><del>“The Some of the world’s</del> <i>Leading atmospheric scientists predict that climate change....”</i></p> <p><i>“According to the EPA, careful measurements have confirmed that greenhouse gas emissions are increasing and that human activities are the primary cause. <del>Scientists now with virtual certainty</del> <u>Most scientists believe that....</u>”</i></p>	<p>7/13 Closed</p>

Issue	Discussion Notes	<u>Status</u>
	<p><u>Public Comments</u></p> <p><u>PC Discussion</u> Language addresses concern.</p>	
<p>9. Policies 113b and 114a (Hinman, Julinsey)</p>	<p><u>PC Preliminary Direction</u> Both of these polices end with "...prevention of inequalities." It was suggested that this be reworded to promote social equity.</p> <p><u>Staff Recommendation &amp; Reasoning</u> Staff has revised the text.</p> <p><i>"Achieve greenhouse gas emissions reductions in both municipal operations and the community at large, with attention given to <del>reduction and prevention of inequalities</del> <u>social equity</u>."</i></p> <p><i>"Achieve criteria air pollutant reductions in both municipal operations and the community at large, with attention given to <del>reduction and prevention of inequalities</del> <u>social equity</u>."</i></p> <p><u>Public Comments</u></p> <p><u>PC Discussion</u> Language addresses concern</p>	<p>6/29 Closed</p>
<p>10. Pesticide and Herbicide Use in City Parks (public comment) Policy NE-94</p>	<p><u>PC Preliminary Direction</u> The Commission requested staff check on current City policy regarding pesticide and herbicide use in city parks.</p> <p><u>Staff Recommendation &amp; Reasoning</u> The Parks and Recreation Department utilizes a comprehensive approach with regards to managing pests (weeds, insects, rodents) on City properties. Current Integrated Pest Management (IPM) practices are utilized by City staff. The Parks and Recreation Department dedicate a large amount of finance resources and staff time towards the education of proper IPM practices. Some of the IPM practices</p>	<p>7/20 Closed</p>

Issue	Discussion Notes	<u>Status</u>
	<p>include implementing different preventative measures to minimize pest problems. Additionally, the City also strives to use the most environmentally safe control measures available for pest control. For a more detailed analysis of the City’s Integrated Pest Management Practices please see Attachment A.</p> <p>7/20 Update - Upon review of written comments, staff finds the response noted above adequately addresses the concern related to limiting the use of pesticides and synthetic fertilizers in City Parks, particularly those located in critical aquifer recharges areas. In addition, Policy NE-94 reads, <i>“Minimize impacts to wildlife and water quality by <u>not using pesticides and fertilizers, and require use of compost amended soils as part of development and maintenance activities. —Should if chemical treatment become necessary, use organic fertilizers and organic pesticides as much as possible, and by restricting the use of inorganic fertilizers and inorganic pesticides in its daily operations.</u> Implement public outreach and educational opportunities to inform residents of the impacts of pesticides on wildlife.”</i> There was a public comment suggesting the addition of “pets and children” to the end of this policy. However, this would not be the appropriate location since this policy is specific to Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas.</p> <p>There was also a public comment to add language on to Policy NE-94 to read as follows: <i>“Require the use of compost amended soils during development/redevelopment to reduce the use of pesticides and fertilizers. <u>Consider using compost tea to inoculate the soil with beneficial microbes, help prevent diseases and pests, help breakdown toxins in the soil and aid in the establishment of healthy plants.</u>”</i> Staff believes that requiring compost amended soils would be inclusive of using compost tea.</p>	

Issue	Discussion Notes	<u>Status</u>
	<p><u>Public Comments</u> It was recommended that pesticide and herbicide use be prohibited in city parks, particularly those in critical aquifer recharge areas such as Anderson Park.</p> <p>7/20 Update - There was a suggestion to add “pets and wildlife” at the end of policy NE-94 and add an additional sentence to NE-94a which addresses compost tea.</p> <p><u>PC Discussion</u> The Commission requested staff to review and respond to written comments.</p> <p>7/20 Update – The Commission requested a minor text change to policy NE-94. They also agreed to leave NE-94a as proposed by staff but requested staff to include narrative text prior to these policies regarding compost amended soils and compost tea.</p>	
<p>11. Policies NE-34 and NE-35, Clarification on Infiltration (public comment)</p>	<p><u>PC Preliminary Direction</u></p> <p><u>Staff Recommendation &amp; Reasoning</u> Staff recommends these policies remain as originally proposed, without amending the text as suggested below. Regarding Policy NE-34, there is no science to justify putting stormwater into groundwater without treatment at this time. For instance, a spill on a roadway has potential to overwhelm the treatment system and go directly to infiltrations. Clean up then becomes extremely costly. The current risk of spills outweighs this issue. Policies exist in the Stormwater Technical Notebook which identify where non pollution generating surfaces infiltration is permitted and prohibited. Additionally, state requirements to implement low impact development techniques will be in the new National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit expected</p>	<p>Closed 7/13</p>

Issue	Discussion Notes	<u>Status</u>
	<p>to be reissued in the next couple of years, it will not be permitted outright to the detriment of the City's shallow, unconfined susceptible drinking water aquifer.</p> <p>Regarding Policy NE-35, grey water and reclaimed water infiltration is not appropriate and too risky for groundwater contamination.</p> <p>7/20 Update - Staff recommends the additional language is not necessary and believes that the policy language is clear and should read as originally proposed.</p> <p>NE-34 <i>Ensure degradation of groundwater quality does not occur. Where appropriate, prohibit the infiltration of runoff from pollution generating surfaces.</i></p> <p>NE-35 <i>Prohibit discharge of wastewater and potentially contaminated stormwater to groundwater. Prohibit reclaimed and grey water from infiltrating in the critical aquifer recharge area in order to preserve the quality of drinking water.</i></p> <p><u>Public Comments</u> These policies prohibit infiltration of water from certain sources. Clarifying language should be added to these policies that allow infiltration when the water has been treated. Specifically it has been requested that these two policies be modified as follows:</p> <p>NE-34 <i>Ensure degradation of groundwater quality does not occur. Where appropriate, prohibit the infiltration of runoff from pollution generating surfaces, <u>without adequate treatment.</u></i></p> <p>NE-35 <i>Prohibit discharge of wastewater and potentially contaminated stormwater to groundwater, <u>without adequate treatment.</u> Prohibit <u>inadequately treated</u> reclaimed and grey water from infiltrating in the critical aquifer recharge area in order to preserve the quality of drinking water.</i></p>	

Issue	Discussion Notes	<u>Status</u>
	<p>7/20 Update - Staff provided clarification regarding policy NE-34 and NE-35 and the recipient withdrew their request to amend both policies.</p> <p><u>PC Discussion</u> Language addresses concern</p>	
12. Brightwater (Hinman)	<p><u>PC Preliminary Direction</u> The Commission would like to know about the natural environmental impacts of reclaimed water usage, such as that from the Brightwater line.</p> <p><u>Staff Recommendation &amp; Reasoning</u> Reclaimed water has the potential to contaminate groundwater. Waste plus residential and industrial chemicals are discharged to the sewer. For instance, medications are often dumped down the drain and people often rinse out household cleaner bottles with water and dump it down the drain. The reclaimed water treatment takes out the particulates (things that don't degrade) and treat fecal coliform and biological oxygen demand. However, the process doesn't treat pharmaceuticals, industrial chemicals, metals, and residential material. These will end up on the groundwater and threaten water quality.</p> <p><u>Public Comments</u> Concern over reclaimed water usage from Brightwater. Its application should be limited.</p> <p><u>PC Discussion</u> The Commission asked general questions regarding the City's position on the use of reclaimed water within City limits.</p>	6/29 Information Request
13. Floodwater Testing (public comment)	<u>PC Preliminary Direction</u>	6/29 Information Request

Issue	Discussion Notes	<u>Status</u>
	<p><u>Staff Recommendation &amp; Reasoning</u> The City does not test water during flood events. King County is the lead agency on the river. However, stormwater sampling occurs during the first flush – when it rains after a long dry spell. This is handled through our Natural Resources Division.</p> <p><u>Public Comments</u> Would like the City to test water during flood events, particularly large flooding events.</p> <p><u>PC Discussion</u></p>	