

**REDMOND PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES**

October 12, 2011

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** Chairman Hinman, Vice Chair Franz Wiechers-Gregory, Commissioners Chandorkar, Flynn, and Miller

**COMMISSIONERS EXCUSED:** Commissioners Biethan and O'Hara

**STAFF PRESENT:** Sarah Stiteler, Kim Dietz, Redmond Planning Department; Jeff Thompson, Scott Thomasson, Lei Wu, Redmond Public Works Department

**RECORDING SECRETARY:** Lady of Letters, Inc.

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Hinman in the Council Chambers at City Hall.

**APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:**

No changes to the agenda.

**ITEMS FROM THE AUDIENCE:**

Mr. Howard Harrison, 17719 NE 110<sup>th</sup> Way, Redmond, Washington, 98052, spoke to the Commission about the use of pesticides. He wanted to respond after the action that was taken earlier by the Commission regarding this issue. He said he plans on addressing the City Council with regard to this matter. Mr. Harrison said the use of pesticides is an environmental problem and a public health hazard. He said the City of Redmond has a good IPM policy, which he has reviewed. His main concern was the very bottom line of the policy, which reads *synthetic pesticides are only used in limited situations when other methods of pest control are not effective or practical*. He said that was a very low threshold, because *limited situations* has an unclear meaning, in his view, as well *not effective or practical*. It could be argued that if it costs more to not use pesticides, then it would not be practical.

Mr. Harrison said his intent and goal is to modify that phrase. He knew that the Commission had recently addressed the banning of pesticides and synthetic fertilizers, and he said that could be altered to allow for emergency situations, especially through the use of pesticides on invasive species such as blackberries. He gave the Commission an article by the Beyond Pesticides organization, which is involved in pesticides. Chairman Hinman thanked Mr. Harrison, and said the Council would look forward to hearing from him as well. There were no other comments from the public at this time.

**REPORT APPROVAL, Water System Plan Update**, presented by Jeff Thompson, City of Redmond Public Works Department.

Chairman Hinman noted that in earlier discussions of this topic, issues have been identified; the report will be considered after consideration of the edits. He asked the Commissioners about the edits shown. The Commission passed this measure subject to some language changes, which

include an executive summary, which has been included. There was also some language regarding the Comprehensive Plan and a phrase relative to water storage in contemplation of growth in the Overlake area. Chairman Hinman asked if there were any concerns about the new language before considering the language of the report itself. Commissioner Flynn thanked staff for doing a great job on the executive summary. It was exactly what he was looking for, and a very useful document. Ms. Stiteler pointed out that there is a corrected page with exhibits included. Hearing no other concerns about the new language, Chairman Hinman moved to the report itself, which would be forwarded to the City Council. Chairman Hinman echoed the appreciation for the executive summary, which he believed was a prudent exercise.

MOTION from Commissioner Miller to recommend approval of the Water System Plan Update, to be forwarded to City Council for consideration. Motion seconded by Commissioner Gregory. Motion approved unanimously (5-0).

**PUBLIC HEARING & STUDY SESSION, Small Animal Husbandry, including Backyard Chickens**, presented by Kim Dietz, City of Redmond Planning Department.

Chairman Hinman opened the public hearing. Ms. Dietz noted that this meeting was about amendments to small animal husbandry policies and codes, including the Zoning Code and Municipal Code. The recommendation from staff involved lot size minimums for female chickens only, hens and pullets. There would be no changes proposed regarding roosters, which are allowed today on half-acre properties and larger. The proposal would be zone-based in that one chicken would be allowed per every 1,000 square feet of the underlying average minimum lot size by zone, and there would be no more than eight female chickens permitted. In an R-8 zone where the underlying minimum lot size average is 3,000 square feet, for example, a person would be allowed three chickens. This would allow a homeowner and code enforcement officer to look up the zone for a property and know how many chickens would be permitted.

Shelters and runs would be permitted inside an area set back from property lines by fifteen feet. Shelters and runs would be screened from adjacent public access corridors, including streets, and chickens would be contained such that they could not stray on other properties. Food and waste would be managed appropriately to prevent rodents from accessing food; waste would be dealt with outside of the setback area, fifteen feet from all property lines. Slaughter would be permitted, with one chicken slaughtered within a 24-hour period. If an owner desires to slaughter more than one, then that would happen outside the residential area. There are services available to help with that.

Mr. Howard Harrison noted that he was here before the Commission representing Sustainable Redmond, a group that supports the proposed animal husbandry item regarding chickens. The group supports the number of chickens for the zoning. Personally, Mr. Harrison said the setback area seems excessive. He offered, from Sustainable Redmond, the opportunity to provide an educational event to inform the public of the details in raising chickens. He attended a similar presentation at the Redmond Library earlier this year, and the presenter at that event agreed to put on a presentation for Sustainable Redmond. He had another resource that could provide educational help as well. Chairman Hinman thanked Mr. Harrison for his testimony and thanked Sustainable Redmond for his offer of help.

Mr. Richard Grubb, 17134 NE 88<sup>th</sup>, Redmond, WA 98052 spoke to the effect of people on chickens. He wanted to make sure the welfare of chickens would be a top priority as to prevent cruelty to these animals. He wanted the City regulations to be crafted in a way such that those who are serious about chicken husbandry would be separate from those who have what he called the Easter chick syndrome, or a cuteness effect. He remarked that the City had a rabbit problem in the 1990's at a Microsoft construction site. Mr. Grubb asked if a permit could be required that would lay out the manner in which the chickens would be contained and housed, how they would be protected from predators, and how they would be protected from inclement weather. A modest bond could be required with such a permit.

Mr. Grubb wanted to discourage the casual and impulse acquisition of chickens. Also, if the killing of chicken is to be allowed, the manner of the slaughter should be specified, and humane. Mr. Grubb welcomed the notion of sustainability and the City's connection to its rural roots. But he wondered where people concerned about this issue were twenty years ago, when people were trying to maintain the City's small-town character and connection to its roots, and even ten years ago, when people were trying to preserve the last remnants of farmland in Redmond. Chairman Hinman thanked Mr. Grubb for his testimony.

Ms. Gitit Banai next spoke to the Commission. Her address is 2420 178<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, Redmond, Washington, 98052. She was in favor of chickens in Redmond. She noted that she had chickens in Bellevue before moving to Redmond. As a household with persons allergic to cats and dogs, she welcomes chickens as a great solution to help her kids connect to the land and sustainability, as well as having pets. Chairman Hinman thanked her for her testimony.

Ms. Carolyn Anderson next spoke to the Commission. Her address is 18441 NE 24<sup>th</sup> Street, Redmond, Washington, 98052. She wanted to talk about linking the number of chickens with the lot size. She said chickens do not need a lot of space, perhaps just a few square feet apiece in her opinion. She assumed that linking the number of chickens to the square footage would be helpful in minimizing disturbances for the neighbors. She disagreed with that notion, and proposed using a maximum of eight chickens regardless of lot size. Using the setbacks provided by the Commission, on an 8,000 square foot lot with eight chickens under the new rules, the chicken coop would be as close as twenty feet to a neighbor's house. So, on a 3,000 square foot lot, following the fifteen foot setback rule, one would also have a twenty foot distance. She asked how that would be different between a 3,000 and 8,000 square foot lot. Chairman Hinman thanked Ms. Anderson for her testimony.

Ms. Karin Duvall next approached the Commission. She lives at 3316 179<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE in Redmond. She was also hoping to have chickens in Redmond as they were a delight of her youth. She agreed that limiting the amount of chickens per lot size was not necessary. She said that a person could support more than three chickens in a healthful way that does not disturb the neighbors. She thought that a fifteen foot setback, what she considers a random number, was the best placement for a chicken coop given the way properties are laid out. On her property, the best spot for a coop would be in the corner of the lot, which is well screened but right up against the lot line. However, that area is furthest from the neighbors' houses, even though it is closest to the lot line. She thanked the Commission for considering this issue.

Commissioner Gregory asked Ms. Duvall her thought about requiring a permit for a coop. She noted that she had a license for her dog, and said that laws appear to be arbitrary in picking out

one animal and not others. She said she would be amenable to a permit, and understood that some people get chickens just because they are cute. She noted that there are some chicken rescue operations that can help families who do not want their animals anymore.

Ms. Anja Mancano next spoke to the Commission. She lives at 17601 NE 31<sup>st</sup> Place. She has concerns about the fifteen foot regulation. It would be a challenge for her property, which is on a slope. She was in favor of requiring a permit for chickens. She hoped that the number of chickens would be increased from three. Chairman Hinman thanked her for her testimony. He noted that this issue would be left open for written comments for another week. He closed the oral portion of the hearing.

Ms. Dietz noted that three email messages have been received by staff from Ms. Skeels [sp], from Mr. and Mrs. Falkin, and from Mr. Featherston. They have been provided to the Commission. These items received on the day of this meeting do not raise any new issues. Two were in favor and one was against the amendment in a general sense. Chairman Hinman noted there were several issues from the public comments, including permits, humane slaughter, lot size limitations and the fifteen-foot setbacks. Commissioner Chandorkar noted another concern about waste and its effect on stormwater runoff.

Ms. Dietz said she would like to create some examples and analysis regarding lot size and setbacks and bring them back to the Commission. Regarding humane slaughter and waste, those items are covered by the county, state, and USDA, so there are provisions in place. Those issues could be brought back by way of example at the next meeting, as well. Permitting could be included in the discussion items this evening. Chairman Hinman noted that the square footage-to-chicken count was a way to help code enforcement officers; Ms. Dietz said it was a simple way for the homeowner to consider this issue as well, and the formula was outlined in public meetings on this issue.

Commissioner Chandorkar asked if the setback issue had been derived from other jurisdictions. Ms. Dietz said that the setbacks were indeed based on what other communities were doing. The lot size determination was the result of a lot of discussion with code enforcement officers. Therefore, after bringing back community meeting input to staff and code enforcement, Ms. Dietz said the idea was to create a plan that was scalable by lot size but also very easy to implement. This would mean a code enforcement officer would not have to measure a lot in the field or guesstimate on lot lines. The proposal would be consistent across the zone and the entire City. The number of chickens was derived from similar discussions with Code Enforcement staff, using the lot size to keep the computation simple.

The Commission was in concurrence that the current proposal should cover female chickens only. There were no changes to the provisions for roosters. Commissioner Miller asked if there was any provision for fowl other than chickens. Ms. Dietz said that the public meetings generated the proposal that other species should not be discussed.

Issue three was a question regarding the ability to sell the chicken-related products, eggs and meat along the side of the sidewalk or street in residential areas. There is a provision for roadside produce stands; it is not a commercial business and a business license would not be required. This type of activity would be limited in that no offsite sales would be permitted without a state Department of Agriculture license. Poultry meat and eggs are regulated through this agency,

which is very specific. If the sale of eggs and meat in the neighborhood escalated to a home-based business, there would be more controls necessary. There are provisions in this proposed language to control neighborhood sales, especially regarding the slaughter threshold provision. Sales in the neighborhood would be small and intermittent, according to Ms. Dietz.

Chairman Hinman asked where the dividing line was between commercial and non-commercial sales. Commissioner Miller asked if the sales in the neighborhoods would be sales for profit. Ms. Dietz said the City would not regulate if the sales were for profit or not for profit. Commissioner Miller noted that the main discussion was over creating sustainability, having an educational pet, or selling eggs as a home business. These are three very different issues over agricultural products in a residential zone. Commissioner Chandorkar asked if a roadside produce stand was the same as a meat stand or an egg stand, in that meat and eggs should be refrigerated. He also noted that with the slaughter of one chicken per day, it does not make sense that meat would actually be sold at the roadside. Chairman Hinman was also unclear on the sales of chicken meat or eggs; he thought this was more along the lines of personal use.

Ms. Dietz noted that this question came up at the last meeting on this issue. She said that the roadside produce stand is allowed, and does not need a permit. It is on a property, not the street. Flowers or zucchini, for example, are not regulated, and eggs and chicken meat would not be regulated in such a manner either. She said that there are regulations in place statewide that would control that type of activity, such as the sale of chicken meat. Therefore, the City does not need to create any code language for that. The act of selling eggs on the roadside would be very self-limiting, in that not many people would want to buy an egg sitting out on a hot summer day.

Commissioner Chandorkar noted the state regulations, but said the enforcement burden on roadside stands selling meat would remain on the City. Ms. Dietz said, in a situation like that, the City would receive a call that a commercial activity was taking place. If there were concerns over the meat, or whatever the roadside stand was producing, that would go to a higher agency. Commissioner Flynn raised a similar concern regarding community health; he does not believe produce stands are comparable with meat and eggs. Ms. Dietz noted that this issue is covered in the Zoning Code and Municipal Code. She asked the Commission to clarify the question to help resolve this issue.

Commissioner Gregory said that the issue revolves around personal use versus commercial use of a chicken coop. He noted that there is a lot of enthusiasm around this issue, but when the fascination fades away, someone will have to pick up the pieces. Commissioner Gregory was concerned about this turning into a commercial activity without that much regulation. He supported discussing a permitting system and bonding system to help enforce regulations. Commissioner Miller echoed those comments, especially regarding the difficulty of enforcement. The County has very few resources to enforce regulation of chicken ownership. He said this would be opening the door to an agricultural practice in areas where people were not expecting it. He added that Mr. Grubb's comments about this phenomenon were spot on. Changing the expectations for residents about a neighborhood would require some protections to be in place, including the ability to afford enforcement.

Commissioner Miller continued that the rabbit problem Mr. Grubb alluded to is still in place, in that the area in question has turned into a supermarket for predators, who are not just taking rabbits, but also pets. He said the challenge for advocates and the Commission is to bring this

issue back to community health and enforcement, and making sure that the Code does not just reference best practices but actually has some teeth and a reasonable chance of being enforced. Chairman Hinman said the question for staff to answer would be creating a regulatory framework that allows for backyard chickens for personal use. The same regulations would apply should there be a commercial component.

Ms. Dietz reminded Chairman Hinman that a roadside stand would not constitute a commercial establishment. She is hearing a lot of questions regarding enforcement, so she will include more information about enforcement in this section. King County Animal services, per discussion with staff, are in a good position despite previous budgetary concerns. Ms. Dietz will bring in more information on that issue. Chairman Hinman noted his question regarding commercial use of chickens would not impact the recommendations made in terms of numbers relative to lot size, setbacks, or other provisions laid out. Ms. Dietz agreed, and said this was an implementation question.

Issue 4 touches the concern about rodents. In the recommendation, staff is asking for an adequate and secured approach. Ms. Dietz showed an example of practices that would be employed on a daily basis. There are a variety of ways an owner can prevent rodents from coming into a chicken coop. Controlling feed is one of the many methods to help keep rodents at bay. Ms. Dietz said the City will create a user's guide for those who would like to have chickens at home. Commissioner Chandorkar asked about the efficacy of these regulations, and how one person could mess up the whole process, which comes back to the enforcement question. He added that the more difficult the process is to have chickens, the more difficult it would be to regulate and monitor. He was concerned about allowing chickens in all zones, due to problems with predators in some areas.

Chairman Hinman went back to the issue table, and the concern over what structure or management process would help prevent the invasion of rodents. He was not sure that Ms. Dietz's answer satisfied Commissioner Miller's question. Commissioner Miller said the use of the word *adequate* creates some problems, and noted that this might lend more weight to the idea of requiring a permit and bond. He asked if creating an enclosure for chickens should be further regulated. Commissioner Gregory said that would be the most effective way to resolve the question. Rather than best practices, he would like permits in place and inspections.

Chairman Hinman noted that Mukilteo has a one-time fee to build a coop, which includes layout of the structure, rodent prevention, and setback concerns. He said that this could be a template to capture the concerns of the Commission, and perhaps could be contained in a new issue on permits and reducing the size effects of chicken ownership. Ms. Dietz said that she had another issue to present on permitting. Many of the issues will remain open pending this new issue, and Chairman Hinman asked them to remain open as the Commission considers the permit and predator issues. Commissioner Flynn asked if a draft of fees for chicken owners could be laid out by staff regarding inspections or other regulatory actions. Commissioner Chandorkar said a permit would discourage the casual chicken owner, which he said would be a benefit. Commissioner Flynn recognized that, but wanted to align fees with City services on that issue. Regarding Issue 4, Chairman Hinman noted that it would be dealt with in light of the permit question.

Issue 7 was about the idea of containing chickens properly on the property to prevent straying. The City is not regulating the actual coop structure, per se. The idea is that if a chicken escapes, it could get home easily. A fence could help in that regard, but a chicken could potentially get on top of that fence. Ms. Dietz said a better idea would be to strengthen the coop structure. Commissioner Flynn asked about helping enforce that chickens do not escape into a neighborhood. Chairman Hinman said more specificity might be in order, and asked Ms. Dietz to get back to the Commission. Commissioner Miller asked about a reference to the vertical aspect of chickens, and called upon the advocacy community for some help. He said that if chickens do get over a fence, neighbors would have some real problems.

Issue 9 was about screening from adjacent property owners. The concern was that this could create a subjective, changing situation and a challenge for code enforcement officers to deal with. She suggested addressing the screening from the areas of the public access corridors, such as streets providing vehicle circulation. Otherwise, the view of a coop from a second-story window could be a problem for a neighbor, and therefore a challenge for a code enforcement officer. Commissioner Chandorkar was concerned about screening as well as possible, and reducing smells from a chicken coop. However, he was not keen on beating the issue to the ground. Chairman Hinman asked if this issue should be closed, with the understanding that there would be screening from public access corridors. He noted this could become part of a permit application. Commissioner Flynn noted that he was not as concerned about the vertical screening of the coop. Chairman Hinman closed the issue.

Chairman Hinman asked about the setbacks and diagram that Ms. Dietz provided regarding the location of a coop. She explained that the coop is centered to the rear of the house and fits within the setback. This scenario was drawn up for three chickens using some recommendations from Seattle Tilth regarding space recommendations per chicken, coverage for the coops, and a chicken run. Ms. Dietz showed a different slide showing a home with more open space in the R-8 zone, as well. It would be next to the rear of the structure. Commissioner Flynn asked about patios or decks off the backs of the house and how that might affect a coop. Ms. Dietz said a coop could exist on the concrete pad of a patio.

Chairman Hinman reviewed the issues matrix. The first issue about code provisions being revised regarding small animal husbandry, especially chickens, drew consensus that the Commission was moving to make that happen. Chairman Hinman closed the issue. The second issue was more informational and regulatory, as to what number of chickens would be necessary to sustain a family. Chairman Hinman closed the issue. Commissioner Chandorkar asked about Issue 1 and the revision of the animal husbandry regulations. He confirmed with Chairman Hinman that closing that issue meant that the Commission was working on the topic, but that not all the provisions were accepted. Commissioner Gregory, however, noted that there were many details, especially about permitting, that were not closed. He said the issue was phrased awkwardly, in that the Commission is considering this, but the outcome is not certain. Ms. Dietz said she would use the language Commissioner Gregory shared and close the issue with that addition. Chairman Hinman agreed the issue was closed.

Issue 2 is closed. Issue 3, regarding the cottage industry, commercial versus non-commercial, has garnered more questions and is open. Issue 4, with regard to management practices relative to rodents, is still open but possibly could be closed when the permit question comes back to the Commission. Chairman Hinman said the issue of dealing with predators was not dealt with in-

depth. Commissioner Chandorkar said this could be a checklist item in a permit and a larger discussion. Chairman Hinman closed the issue.

The next issue dealt with avian influenza. Commissioner Chandorkar noted that in these cases, by the time the City is aware of a problem, it could be an epidemic already and too late for action. He is concerned about this type of problem, and is not sure how ready Redmond is for avian influenza. Chairman Hinman left the issue open.

Issue 7 was about containment, which might be addressed in a permit application. Chairman Hinman next spoke about Issue 8, code provisions from neighboring jurisdictions, which have been provided. This was largely an informational issue, and Chairman Hinman closed the issue. Mukilteo is the only municipality that requires permitting of chickens, the so-called coop license. Issue 9 dealt with screening, which the Commission has discussed already, but will keep in mind. A diagram has been provided to show a coop on a 3,000 square foot lot as part of Issue 10, which Chairman Hinman closed. Questions added to the issues matrix include the commercialization of egg and chicken meat sales and the enforcement of slaughter regulations, with overarching community health concerns. Chairman Hinman said there was also a question regarding the ratio of animals per lot size and whether a fifteen-foot setback was needed, or a more site-specific component. Commissioner Flynn had an additional request on Issue 6, regarding avian flu. He asked how much of the testing done in 2011 in the state was in the Seattle metro area. Chairman Hinman asked the Commission to look at the recommended Code language provided by staff before the next meeting. He closed the study session and called for a brief recess.

**BRIEFING, TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN**, presented by Lei Wu, Redmond Public Works Department.

Ms. Wu noted she was looking for direction from the Commission regarding the development of the Transportation Facilities Plan, for the process and criteria. This is a plan that supports land use vision and planned land use growth target for 2030. It is also a funding constraint plan. A final community event regarding this plan will be held on November 17<sup>th</sup> in Redmond City Hall at 6:00 P.M. The idea is to ask participants to validate the draft plan. On November 30<sup>th</sup>, staff will come back to the Commission with a report incorporating comments from the community event. A draft TFP is planned for January of next year, with formal public hearings expected in February or March and adoption by May 2012. The TFP will have several enhancement features. Each project in the plan will have a system project definition, such as project type, intent, status, and neighborhood location, which should make it convenient for planning purposes. The TFP will also have a new cost estimating system which will allow for changes during the process, thus creating more precision.

A risk assessment will be included in the TFP as well, including environmental impacts and feasibility risks in construction, as well as major impacts on rights-of-way and other factors. The risk indicator shows how much the impacts are and how likely the impact will be. Each project will thus have an associated cost estimate based on that indicator. Ms. Wu showed the Commission a road map of the process, noting the differences between build-out and the TFP. She displayed a candidate project database and some accomplishments over the past few years. The TFP had sixty-five projects and twelve programs in 2005. By 2010, staff delivered about twenty-eight projects. Commissioner Miller asked about projects that are not completed and how many are in the process or not delivered. Commissioner Chandorkar asked for some reasons why



the projects not completed are that way. Ms. Wu noted that the TFP is a twenty-year horizon plan.

One large completed project is the 36<sup>th</sup> Street Bridge over Highway 520. There were seven sources of funding for this project, including three outside sources such as Microsoft. In order to get to a new build-out plan, staff has to answer several questions for each project, including feasibility such as considering environmental issues, right-of-way acquisition issues, design and construction details, and value of the project in the community. This is significant, because what is on the build-out plan is what developers are required to build. So, if a project does not meet the criteria of a feasibility plan, it would not go through.

The build-out plan would have several types of projects: some that meet basic needs, including safety projects, maintenance projects, natural environment projects, and vision-related projects like community character developments. The TFP criteria are used to evaluate individual projects using a scorecard approach, which creates high, medium, and low priority projects. Also, staff would coordinate how the project works with other projects in the process along the same corridor. After the build-out plan is prioritized, the available funding revenue is applied to the prioritized build out plan. Commissioner Flynn asked if what Ms. Wu showed was an accurate representation of what gets funded and what does not. Ms. Wu said it was not; rather, she applied her own personal opinion to the display. Commissioner Chandorkar asked about the unfunded build-out items, and if they would get a higher priority in the next TFP. Ms. Wu said that would not happen automatically. Chairman Hinman noted that sometimes, those unfunded projects can move up the chain if something changes, like a new influx of money or a new nearby development project. Commissioner Flynn said that this was consistent with the Budgeting-by-Priorities process.

Ms. Wu continued that there would be performance measures applied to the projects in the later part of the process consistent with TFP criteria. Therefore, there would be a final reckoning of cost and benefits. Example performance measures include state of good repair, maintenance, connectivity, and network mobility performance. She asked the Commission for any comments regarding the TFP criteria, which would be used to score the build-out plan projects. Ms. Wu looked at the PSRC's criteria for Transportation 2040 and the state legislative investment principles, as well as the draft criteria for the Connecting Washington Task Force, the USDOT deliverability principles, and the Tiger Grant evaluation criteria to develop Redmond's criteria. The City criteria align with these other criteria as a way to help gain grant money in the future.

Ms. Wu showed examples of hypothetical projects by way of illustration, such as extending a freeway to the southern City limit, which would involve several agencies. The second project was a connector arterial through a wetland area. Ms. Wu showed another possibility of connecting neighborhoods through a priority corridor, a new concept that came from the *multi-modal corridor* concept shown in the last plan. The idea of multimodal corridors is to have the best sidewalks, best bike facilities, best transit facilities, and a calm car flow on the same corridors. But the reality is that ten of the twelve multi-modal corridors have the highest traffic volumes, which create challenges that make the multi-modal goals unrealistic.

Ms. Wu spoke next about priority corridors that could be created, with separation between the different modes of transportation. The idea is to work hand-in-hand with complete streets. Complete streets ask for accommodation for all types of uses, not necessarily with priorities, but

with at least something basic for every mode of transit. Ms. Wu noted that the scoring method for different projects would be based on their ability to provide for different modes of transportation.

Chairman Hinman said the methodology looks fine. Commissioner Gregory asked if the criteria were all equal and not weighted differently. Ms. Wu said that would be correct. Commissioner Miller asked how the criteria are defined and if certain characteristics are double-counted. He asked if all projects, by ordinance, were to include bike and pedestrian elements, why those criteria had to be used for prioritizing. That appears to be double-counting to him. Also, with mobility, which was at first a nod toward freight mobility, now includes bike and pedestrian elements. That, in Commissioner Miller's opinion, confuses the issue for bikes, pedestrians, and freight carriers. He asked if the criteria were really honing in on the questions and principles that were defined earlier.

Commissioner Miller said he liked the separation of basic needs from vision, in terms of what is needed versus what is wanted. He asked about the environmental criteria and how it was applied to transportation projects, in terms of improving air quality or water flow, as opposed to environmental improvement projects that happen to be funded with transportation dollars. Commissioner Miller asked if there were a direct connection between the project and its funding in this case. Ms. Wu said each project would deal with air quality by trying to reduce vehicular traffic, for example; stormwater treatment requirements would have to be met as well. Commissioner Miller asked if the criteria measured the performance of the project or helped design the scope of the project. It appeared to some Commissioners that a stormwater flow control project could have transportation dollars paying for it, which was not the intent.

Chairman Hinman noted that the Commission had vetted the principles, but their manifestation as criteria were still in question. He asked about high-capacity transit and a possible connection with light rail or buses. In referencing an earlier topic, Ms. Wu noted that weighting criteria puts safety higher in many cases. She added that PSRC's weighting method has become very complicated. In 2005, when Redmond first established the Transportation Master Plan, a simpler system of ten criteria was used. That system now is more sophisticated. Ms. Wu said there is a Transportation Safety Improvement Program that specifically targets safety issues. With maintenance, there is a new program incorporating a few programs in the current TMP, including the pavement management program that helps reduce the life-cycle costs of pavement management. Another current maintenance program is the Bridge Repair Program, which says that all bridges have to meet certain safety ratings. There is also an infrastructure program, dealing with traffic signals, street lighting, and landscaping.

Commissioner Miller asked if the presence of leveraged funding during different parts of the process would affect how that project meets certain TFP criteria. He wanted to know when that funding should be applied: before or after the projects met the test of the criteria. Ms. Wu agreed to answer that question in the future. Commissioner Flynn had a question about the criteria and the scoring of low, medium, and high. He asked if that scoring would be possible for each category without some definition of what low, medium and high would be. Ms. Wu agreed there can be some debate on this issue. She said that in the past, she has brought along transportation experts to help define those terms in the case of a dispute. Chairman Hinman asked about a risk overlay, which is not listed as a criterion. Ms. Wu said that question is part of the feasibility

screening. If a project, based on staff's judgment, cannot be delivered based on risk, it would be deemed not feasible and not go forward.

Ms. Wu said that the next step for staff would be sorting through the candidate project database with documented sources in order to create a build-out plan. That would be in preparation for the November 17<sup>th</sup> community event, to which the Commission is warmly invited. Chairman Hinman concluded this agenda item. Ms. Wu will follow up with Commissioner Miller on a few specific issues after this meeting.

**REPORT APPROVAL, RECONCILIATION ITEMS, INCLUDING AMENDMENTS TO INTRODUCTION OF COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, Final Planning Commission review of outstanding amendments, 2010-2011 Comprehensive Plan update**, presented by Sarah Stiteler, Redmond Planning Department.

Ms. Stiteler directed the Commission to look at the report that reflects the discussion the Commission had on the introduction, VISION 2040 statement, and remaining reconciliation items. Chairman Hinman noted that the Commission recommended the amendments with a few edits. The edits have been indicated in the issues matrix. There were no questions about the edits, nor any questions about the overall report to City Council.

MOTION by Commissioner Flynn to approve the Planning Commission's report to City Council on Reconciliation Items for the Comprehensive Plan. Motion seconded by Commissioner Miller. Motion approved unanimously (5-0).

**REPORTS/SCHEDULING/TOPICS FOR NEXT MEETING(S):**

Ms. Stiteler said there will not be a meeting on November 23<sup>rd</sup>; the meeting on November 2<sup>nd</sup> is not certain at this time. Chairman Hinman noted that there may be some lighter meetings in the future. He will yield the gavel to Commissioner Gregory for the next two meetings, when Chairman Hinman will be unavailable. He thanked Commissioner Gregory for his leadership.

**ADJOURN**

Chairman Hinman adjourned the meeting at approximately 9:23 p.m.

Minutes Approved On: Planning Commission Chair