Methodology

**TASK 1 PROJECT MANAGEMENT**

1.1 Kickoff meeting
We will introduce our team, establish roles and responsibilities, determine communication protocols, review project objectives, confirm scope of work, schedule and deliverables, and solicit the base information required for Task 2. Additionally, we will run a city-consultant workshop to co-define a series of principles to guide the project.

1.2 Bi-weekly meetings
We will prepare agendas, produce minutes, and track action items for up to 18 bi-weekly coordination meetings with City’s PM. These can be virtual or in-person, as is viable. The meetings intend to proactively coordinate the project and are opportunity to review schedule, budget, and actions using an integrated schedule and budget tracking spreadsheet. In addition to these scheduled meetings, our PM may request additional project status conference calls if the pace of the project demands it, urgent corrective action is required, or crucial decisions need to be made.

1.3 Redmond 2050 coordination meetings
In parallel to the project meetings, our PM will attend up to 4 coordination meetings with the wider Redmond 2050 team. Ideally, these meetings should coincide with the SEPA integration meetings of Task 5. We recommend these meetings happen before the implementation stages of this project, to best align it with the wider Redmond 2050 expectations.

1.4 Council & Planning Commission meetings
We have budgeted up to 6 meetings to accompany City staff for presentations at the Planning Commission and before Council. We will be able to assist in presenting technical matters or insights from the process, as well as preparing the supporting slide decks.

**TASK 2 EXISTING CONDITIONS**

2.1 Market information collection and analysis
With ECONorthwest’s experience (including on the Redmond Housing Needs Assessment), and leveraging the UrbanFootprint platform, we will evaluate current market opportunities for use in our development feasibility analysis. By developing socio-economic performance metrics that drive growth demands in mixed-use centers, we can reality-test our development scenarios. We will start by defining the city’s population density, built form characteristics, and community demographics. To gain information about local market conditions, ECONorthwest will analyze real estate development fundamentals (rents, sales prices, vacancies, development trends, and building permits) and interview local real estate professionals for pertinent data.

2.2 Policy & regulatory review
IBI Group will review and summarize all applicable policies and regulations that could impact the allocation of
anticipated growth, providing a summary for each area of application. A focus of this review will be on the urban center boundary location, urban form standards and requirements (lot size, density, height, land use, etc.), and applicable development incentives.

2.3 Current public outreach results review

Prior to starting the engagement process, 3Si and IBI Group will review prior neighborhood and city-level engagement efforts (such as the Redmond Link Extension outreach) to crystalize recurring themes that have already surfaced and identify any area where deeper understanding is needed. The analysis will also include any planned engagement activities for the broader Redmond 2050 initiative. This review will ensure that our engagement strategy does not repeat well understood community sentiment in our engagement activities, minimizing citizen fatigue.

TASK 3 COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

3.1 Engagement plan

Using the insights from the outreach results review, IBI Group and 3Si will produce a tailored engagement plan for the Visioning process, which will be guided by the restrictions imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic. The engagement plan will include a summary matrix with the engagement activity, intended audience, objectives, communication channels, team roles, medium/location, and dates.

3.2 ‘Concerns & aspirations’ digital engagement

If deemed necessary after review of past efforts, we could include a deeper dive into community aspirations and concerns, utilizing a digital version of IBI’s ‘Gains & Pains’ exercise, which asks for perceived positive and negative aspects of growth in the station areas. We will require two rounds of engagement: One to ‘crowdsource’ community input, the second to rank and prioritize this input.

3.3 ‘Focus of growth’ digital engagement

For the first core digital engagement module, we will use a small number of the development scenarios of Task 4.4 to inform an interactive development tool. To give feedback, participants would “play” with a series of parameters (distance from transit, distance from single-family areas, distribution of density, etc.) to allocate the intended growth for each area, making them aware of the trade-offs between density, application area and growth targets. IBI Group will produce a crowdsourced average development model for each of the 4 areas, which will inform our scenario selection in Task 4.5.

3.4 ‘Form of Development’ digital engagement

The second core digital engagement activity will focus on development typologies and could take the form of a ‘virtual open house’ with 3 interactive activities:

1. A ‘visual preference survey’ showing different buildings, styles, and relationships to the public realm and neighboring buildings.
2. A ‘design principles ranking exercise’, mimicking IBI Group’s ‘Priorities Card Game’, where we test aspects that would drive building design, e.g., ground floor transparency.
3. A ‘typology & integration tradeoffs survey’, where we illustrate different typologies in terms of massing, height, and land-use mix, showing the pros/cons of each.

The results will be played back to the community and inform the preferred alternative of Task 4.6.
3.5 Targeted stakeholder outreach

Given that many people in traditionally underserved communities may not be in a situation to participate, we can instead reach out to neighborhood organizations interacting with these communities. We would hold in-person or virtual interviews with these community-based organizations to test the themes that we distilled from Task 2.4 and see if they still hold. We can also share 1-2 key questions for them to reach out to their base as part of their normal community interaction.

TASK 4 LAND USE ALTERNATIVES

4.1 Baseline development feasibility & gap analysis

Based on the current zoning and the policy review of Task 2.2, IBI Group’s parametric planning team will build a parcel-based 3D model of the 4 urban centers to test how much new residential and employment growth can be realistically be absorbed, given current regulations within the current area boundary. We will discuss with the City relevant criteria to determine the growth absorption potential, given that not every parcel will be conducive to redevelopment due to lot size, existing investment, distance to transit, etc. With the baseline model in place, we will determine the gap in growth figures that will need to be accommodated in any of the future scenarios.

4.2 Market-based building prototypes

Informed by the market analysis of Task 2.1 and the TOD case studies of Task 2.3, ECONorthwest and IBI Group will work with the City to determine prototypical buildings customized for the local conditions of the four focus study areas, noting whether they would be allowable with current zoning. Key aspects that will be considered for the prototype options include ideal ranges of lot size, lot coverage, floor plate size, height, FAR, mix of uses, and parking supply. The insights from this activity will inform the feasibility study in Task 4.1, by providing information regarding the massing of building types currently permitted.

4.3 Threshold for development proforma analysis

For each of the prototypical buildings, ECONorthwest will produce a dynamic proforma model to test the impacts of potential actions on development feasibility. With this, we will test baseline development feasibility, i.e., how feasible it would be to construct each of the prototypical building types under current code requirements in each of the areas. If not currently feasible, we would calculate the minimum threshold density (and other massing criteria) required for redevelopment, which will become the basis for consideration of the prototype in future scenarios.

4.4 Parametric boundary & urban form scenario development

With the inputs from Tasks 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3, the team will develop a parametric scenario model that builds on the baseline model to test a large number of potential boundary, typology, density, and community amenity distribution scenarios. Each scenario considered will need to meet the minimum thresholds for redevelopment of each building prototype, as well as any infrastructure servicing and SEPA review factor limitations. All scenarios will be assessed against performance criteria co-defined with the City which could include average distance to transit, integration to surrounding areas, average height, displacement of current residents, level of investment, etc. A small number of distinct scenarios will also be used as a base for the ‘Focus of Growth’ digital engagement module of Task 3.3.
4.5 Scenario selection
Taking into account community feedback, the proforma analysis, the team’s TOD expertise, the SEPA and infrastructure teams’ input, and client opinion, we would choose a preferred growth scenario for each of the 4 station areas, locking in densities, heights, land use mix, and boundaries. The parametric model will provide an excellent decision-making tool for this, as it can assign weights to the performance criteria, which can dynamically be changed to visualize, in real time, what-if scenarios.

4.6 Typology refinement and preferred scenario development
Once the preferred scenario for each of the four areas is determined, the team will dig deeper into the form of development. A major input for this task will be the ‘Form of Development’ engagement module, where the community will express their priorities on preferred typologies and how to integrate them with the surrounding context. The design team will use this input to refine the typologies and incorporate specifics on building form (height, setbacks, articulation, etc.). This will then inform the implementation stage in Task 6. Each of the refined typologies will be tested with an updated proforma sensitivity analysis by ECONorthwest to ensure they meet the redevelopment threshold. Finally, the refined typologies will be distributed in each of the four areas and optimized with parametrics to maximize the previously defined performance metrics.

**TASK 5 INTEGRATION**

5.0 Team integration
We propose continuous coordination between the engagement, land use, and financial activities of our consultancy and the parallel Comprehensive Plan SEPA update consultancy throughout scenario development. This will flow in two directions: Integration of environmental review factors and other inputs will inform the boundary/density/typology parameters of the scenarios, while our selected scenarios and engagement process’ insights will inform the SEPA review. We recommend coordination meetings (up to 10) with the SEPA consultant at the start and mid-point of Tasks 4.1, 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6 so that trade-off discussions and decisions can occur at key moments without costly retracking of work.

Additionally, we recommend holding coordination meetings (up to 5) with City staff or the consultant entrusted with the modeling of the transportation, water and sewer components for the Comprehensive Plan update. Of importance to the scenario development process will be limitations on infrastructure capacity that would affect the growth potential of the station areas in terms of density or service boundaries, which should be defined by the start of Task 4.4.

**Objective:** To ensure alignment and coordination with parallel processes, avoiding duplication of effort

**Deliverables:**
- Meeting agendas
- Meeting minutes
- SEPA and infrastructure integration summary report

**TASK 6 INTEGRATION**

6.0 SEPA documents
This line item will support the work on Task 5.0 with the Comprehensive Plan SEPA update consultancy to work together on public engagement and documentations as necessary.
TASK 7 IMPLEMENTATION

7.1 Policy & regulatory implications
Once the preferred alternative has been determined in Task 4.5, with consideration of the completed regulatory review in Task 2.3, our planners will methodically assess the policy documents that will need to be updated, added, or revoked to ensure the growth targets can realistically be accommodated. Optional Task 4.6 could provide more granularity and detail, especially regarding incentives. This assessment will be summarized in a matrix for use by the City during Phase 2 of the project, classifying the recommended edits by type, complexity, importance and phasing priority.

7.2 Policy assistance
To further refine typologies and catalyse the preferred alternative from Tasks 4.5 and 4.6, the IBI Group team will assist with the development of design standards and other city policy that clarifies the vision for future growth as needed.

Contingency
A contingency fund has been included to further support the regulatory work in 7.2 Implementation or additional outreach / engagement as needed.

Objective: To define the regulatory and guidance tools that make vision implementation possible
Deliverables:
- Policy & regulatory implications technical memorandum and matrix
- Design standards and city policy assistance