

	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> 7/27/11 Further edits in support of Commissioner feedback are proposed on pages 1, 2, and 10, and appear as highlighted text.</p> <p>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.</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>7/20/11 Staff's intended approach is satisfactory. Issue closure pending Planning Commission receipt of proposed text amendment.</p>	<p>Opened 7/13/11</p>

	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), 3 rd bullet	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> 7/27/11 Staff proposes the following modification to proposed policy CF-7, 3rd bullet, page 17:</p> <p><i>Help the City leverage capital investments and ensure wise <u>effective</u> use of public funds.</i></p> <p>7/20/11 Staff will provide alternative wording.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u></p> <p>7/20/11 The proposed text change is satisfactory.</p>	<p>Opened 7/13/11</p> <p>Closed 7/20/11</p>

	Issue/Commissioner	Policy/Section	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
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> 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u></p> <p>7/20/11 Staff’s intended approach is satisfactory. Issue closure pending Planning Commission receipt of proposed text amendment.</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)	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> 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.</p> <p>A similar arrangement is held for one tank and pump station with the City of Bellevue, near 148th Ave and 40th St.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>7/20/11 Will consult with Public Works staff and provide information as part of the July 20 Planning Commission meeting.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u></p> <p>7/20/11 Response is satisfactory.</p>	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	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> 7/20/11</p> <p>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> <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> <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> 7/20/11 Response is satisfactory.</p>	Opened 7/13/11 Closed 7/20/11

	Issue/Commissioner	Policy/Section	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
Capital Facilities			<p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u></p> <p>7/20/11 Staff's intended approach is satisfactory. Issue closure pending Planning Commission receipt of proposed text amendment.</p>	

	Issue/Commissioner	Policy/Section	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
Capital Facilities	7. Public-private partnerships (Public Comment)	Part D, <i>Redmond's Revenue Sources</i>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u></p> <p>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.</p> <p><i>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. <u>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.</u></i></p> <p>CF-15: <i>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. <u>As appropriate, pursue alternative financing strategies such as public-private partnerships to further support the capital program.</u></i></p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p>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</p> <p><u>PC Comments</u></p>	

	Issue/Commissioner	Policy/Section	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
Utilities	8. Utility undergrounding (Staff-proposed discussion issue)	UT-14, 15	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p><u>Public Comment #1, 7/20/11</u> 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.</p>	Opened 7/20

Planning Commission Issues Matrix
 2010-2011 Comprehensive Plan Update – Capital Facilities & Utilities Elements (L100259)

Issue/Commissioner	Policy/Section	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
		<p><u>Public Comment #2, 7/20/11</u> Suggests amendments to Policy UT-15 which would limit applicability of UT-15 to the project site.</p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u></p> <p>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.</p>	

	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.	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u></p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 meet current standards 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.</p> <p><u>Public Comment #1, 7/20/11</u> Proposed policy modifications to clarify applicability in urban centers and conditions for when green infrastructure techniques need to be implemented.</p> <p><u>Public Comment #2, 7/20/11</u> 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.</p> <p><u>Public Comment #3, 7/20/11</u> Comments were similar to, and reinforced Public Comment #2, and the commenter provided additional language modification.</p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u></p>	Opened 7/20
	July 27, 2011			Page 11 of 16

	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	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u></p> <p>7/27/11 While urban centers are locations 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u></p>	Opened 7/20

	Issue/Commissioner	Policy/Section	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
Utilities	11. Coordination with energy service providers	UT-58; New 12	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u></p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p><u>Public Comment #1, 7/20/11</u> 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.</p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u></p>	Opened 7/20

Issue/Commissioner	Policy/Section	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
12. Breadth of new policies in Energy section	Energy section; Policies New 15-21	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u></p> <p>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.</p> <p><u>Public Comment #1, 7/20/11</u> Policies New 15-21, though laudable, are overly broad and need clarification. Could result in regulations that are impractical or economically infeasible.</p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u></p>	Opened 7/20

Issue/Commissioner	Policy/Section	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
13. Energy audits when buildings transfer ownership (Flynn)	Energy section, Policy New 19	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u></p> <p>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:</p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u></p> <p>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.</p>	Opened 7/20

Issue/Commissioner	Policy/Section	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
14. Suggested edits to overall Energy section (Hinman)	Energy section - all	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u></p> <p>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.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u> Commissioner Hinman provided suggested edits to the Energy section in writing. That document has been distributed to the full Commission for consideration.</p>	