



**PLANNING COMMISSION REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION TO  
CITY COUNCIL**  
October 22, 2025

<b>Project File Number:</b>	<b>LAND-2025-00239   SEPA-2020-00934</b>	
<b>Proposal Name:</b>	<b>Capital Facilities Plan 2050 - General Government</b>	
<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>City of Redmond</b>	
<b>Staff Contacts:</b>	Cameron Zapata, Senior Park Planner	425-556-2328
	Glenn Coil, Senior Planner	425-556-2742
	Quinn Kuhnhausen, Facilities Manager	425-556-2716

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

**Public Hearing and Notice**

**a. Planning Commission Study Sessions and Public Hearing Dates**

- i. The City of Redmond Planning Commission held study sessions on Sept. 24, Oct. 8, and Oct. 22, 2025.
- ii. The City of Redmond Planning Commission held a public hearing on the proposed amendments on Oct. 8, 2025. One public comment was received and is included in Appendix D.

**b. Notice and Public Involvement**

The public hearing notice was published in the Seattle Times on Sept. 17, 2025, in accordance with RZC 21.76.080 Review Procedures. Notice was also provided by including the hearing schedule in Planning Commission agendas and extended agendas and distributed by email to various members of the public and various agencies.

**Redmond Comprehensive Plan Amendment Summary and Criteria Evaluation**

This amendment to the Capital Facilities element of the Redmond 2050 Comprehensive Plan will incorporate, by reference, the Capital Facilities Plan 2050 - General Government (CFP2050). Per Comprehensive Plan Policy CF-3, functional plans - or portions of functional plans - are adopted into the Comprehensive Plan when they are used to fulfill Growth Management Act requirements.

The CFP2050 supports and implements the vision of the Redmond 2050 Comprehensive Plan by ensuring Redmond has the facilities it needs to serve the community today and into the future. It prioritizes needs and recommends investments in Fire, Police, Public Works, Park Operations, Park Recreation and Administration facilities over the next 25 years.

This plan updates and supersedes the Capital Facilities Plan 2025-30: General Government Facilities by extending the planning horizon to 2050.

The full plan is provided in Appendix E, Attachment B.

The Capital Facilities Plan 2050- General Government supports the Comprehensive Plan by:

- Aligning with the GMA, Vision 2050 and King Countywide Planning Policies
- Meeting Capital Facilities element requirements

Planning Commission Report - Findings and Conclusions

**Capital Facilities Plan 2050 - General Government**

October 22, 2025

- Complying with Capital Facilities policies FW-CF-1, CF-2, CF-6, CF-18, and CR-39
- Advancing equity and sustainability goals
- Aligning with Redmond 2050 which includes a facilities vision statement, general inventory, level-of-service, and goals and policies that guide financial decisions.
- Directs the development of the City's capital investment program in support of the community's vision.

**Staff Analysis**

Staff analysis for this proposal can be found in Appendix E (Technical Committee Report - Attachment A).

**Recommended Conclusions of the Technical Committee**

On Sept. 17, 2025, the Technical Committee reviewed the Capital Facilities Plan 2050 - General Government as an amendment to the Redmond 2050 Comprehensive Plan, as documented in Appendix E, and found the amendment to be consistent with applicable review criteria and therefore recommended approval.

**RECOMMENDED CONCLUSIONS**

The Planning Commission has reviewed:

- A. *Applicable criteria for approval: RZC 21.76.070 Criteria for Evaluation and Action, and*
- B. *The Technical Committee Report (Appendix E)*

The Planning Commission discussion can be found in Appendix A - Issues Matrix. Discussion topics included:

- Facility projects eligible that could utilize development incentives in RZC 21.55
- Climate resiliency and sustainability
- Community outreach process
- Identification and prioritization of projects
- Financing and revenue sources

**Recommendation**

The Planning Commission reviewed the amendment to the Redmond 2050 Comprehensive Plan and found the amendment to be consistent with applicable review criteria and therefore recommends approval with conditions and summarized below:


Recommended narrative:

Location	Proposed text	Description
Section 1.1, subsection "Redmond 2050 and the Capital Facilities Element"	<p><u>FW-CR-2 Ensure City services, infrastructure, and community members are resilient to climate impacts.</u></p> <p><u>CR-10 Account for climate change impacts when planning, siting, designing, specifying building materials, and operating capital facility, utility, and infrastructure projects.</u></p> <p><u>CR-11 Integrate local climate impact risk assessment findings and climate projections into hazard</u></p>	Additional text to recognize climate-related policies

Planning Commission Report - Findings and Conclusions

**Capital Facilities Plan 2050 - General Government**

October 22, 2025

	<p><u>mitigation planning and other strategic plans.</u>  <u>CR-12 Factor climate impacts into the planning of operations and coordination of preparedness, response, and recovery activities.</u></p>											
<p>Section 1.2 Section 1.2, under subsection "Other Sustainability Measures"</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <del>Consider opportunities to use</del> <u>Commit to integrating durable, climate-resilient materials with low-embodied carbon materials</u> when designing and constructing new facilities</li> </ul>	<p>Updated text under 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point</p>										
<p>Section 1.2, under subsection "Other Sustainability Measures"</p>	<p>In the current Capital Investment Program (CIP), \$1.3M is set aside for citywide sustainability improvements including automation of HVAC controls and converting to LED lighting, and is \$1.7M is provided for electric vehicle charging equipment at the Municipal Parking Garage, Fire Station 11, and Fire Station 12. Moving forward, the City intends to incorporate sustainability improvements in all major projects for general government facilities <u>and to conduct a climate vulnerability assessment as part of the design phase of new facility construction.</u></p>	<p>New text on climate assessments</p>										
<p>Section 1.2, subsection "Summary of Hazards"</p>	<p>In the context of the CFP, emergency preparedness and resilience to natural hazards involves potential risks from incidents like large earthquakes, flooding, major urban fires, wildfires, <u>extreme heat</u>, winter storms, power outages, utility disruptions (e.g. water supply), health hazards, terrorism, civil disturbances, and cyber attacks.</p>	<p>Add "extreme heat" as example hazards</p>										
<p>Section 1.5 (1.4 in draft)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2027-2032</b></p>  <table border="1"> <caption>Revenue Source Percentages (2027-2032)</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Source</th> <th>Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>General Fund</td> <td>42%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>REET</td> <td>17%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Impact Fees</td> <td>9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other</td> <td>1%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Source	Percentage	General Fund	42%	REET	17%	Impact Fees	9%	Other	1%	<p>Updated revenue source percentages for the 2027-2032 timeframe.</p> <p>Staff note that the restricted funding sources in 2027-2032 are already allocated to other projects in the current CIP. Table replaced with pie charts.</p>
Source	Percentage											
General Fund	42%											
REET	17%											
Impact Fees	9%											
Other	1%											
<p>Section 1.5 (1.4 in draft)</p>	<p><u>Note that for the 2027-2032 timeframe all routine maintenance cost funding is assigned to general fund because the other funding sources are restricted by</u></p>	<p>New text at end of section.</p>										

Planning Commission Report - Findings and Conclusions

**Capital Facilities Plan 2050 - General Government**

October 22, 2025

	<p><u>the current CIP. For 2033-2040 and 2041-2050, routine maintenance cost funding is combined with capital costs.</u></p> <p><u>Once construction of the Maintenance and Operations Center is complete, no other projects in the plan are eligible to use Utilities revenue, which is why the Utilities share drops to 0% in the 2033-2040 and 2041-2050 timeframes.</u></p>	<p>Answers a question about why the Utilities share of estimated revenue source drops to 0%.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.7</b></p>	<p>Redmond Public Works operates Well No. 4 on the east side of the municipal campus to provide critical freshwater supplies for the city (<u>see the Water System Plan for more information</u>).</p>	<p>Provide a reference to Water System Plan for more information.</p>

DocuSigned by:  
  
DA525C34AC764BC...  
**Carol Helland**  
 Planning and Community Development Director

Signed by:  
  
2E66B184628E4A6...  
**Susan Weston**  
 Planning Commission Chair

**Appendices**

- A. Planning Commission Issues Matrix - Final
- B. Public Hearing Notice
- C. Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
- D. Written Public Comments
- E. Technical Committee Report with Exhibits
  - Att. A - Staff Compliance & Analysis*
  - Att. B - Capital Facilities Plan 2050 - General Government*



Redmond Planning Commission Report: Appendices  
Capital Facilities Plan 2050 - General Government

- A. Planning Commission Issues Matrix - Final
- B. Public Hearing Notice
- C. Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
- D. Written Public Comments
- E. Technical Committee Report with Exhibits
  - Att. A - Staff Compliance & Analysis*
  - Att. B - Capital Facilities Plan 2050 - General Government*

Item	Discussion Notes	Issue Status																				
<b>1. RZC Incentives</b>  Weston	<p><b><u>Commission Discussion</u></b></p> <p>Which facilities are eligible for the development incentives under RZC 21.55?</p> <p><b><u>Staff Comments</u></b></p> <p>Three projects were identified that could apply the development incentives offered by RZC 21.55.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>CFP2050 Project Name</th> <th>Functional Area</th> <th>Time Period</th> <th>RZC 21.55 Name</th> <th>Category</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Overlake administrative annex</td> <td>Administration</td> <td>Near</td> <td>City Hall outpost</td> <td>Catalyst</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Overlake community center</td> <td>Parks</td> <td>Medium and long</td> <td>Community center or library</td> <td>Catalyst</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pool construct replacement</td> <td>Parks</td> <td>Beyond 2050</td> <td>Aquatic center</td> <td>Catalyst <i>(only applies to Overlake)</i></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	CFP2050 Project Name	Functional Area	Time Period	RZC 21.55 Name	Category	Overlake administrative annex	Administration	Near	City Hall outpost	Catalyst	Overlake community center	Parks	Medium and long	Community center or library	Catalyst	Pool construct replacement	Parks	Beyond 2050	Aquatic center	Catalyst <i>(only applies to Overlake)</i>	<p>Opened 8/27/2025</p> <p>Closed 9/24/2025</p>
CFP2050 Project Name	Functional Area	Time Period	RZC 21.55 Name	Category																		
Overlake administrative annex	Administration	Near	City Hall outpost	Catalyst																		
Overlake community center	Parks	Medium and long	Community center or library	Catalyst																		
Pool construct replacement	Parks	Beyond 2050	Aquatic center	Catalyst <i>(only applies to Overlake)</i>																		
<b>2. Sustainability</b>  Copley	<p><b><u>Commission Discussion</u></b></p> <p>How is sustainability incorporated into the CFP?</p> <p><b><u>Staff Comments</u></b></p> <p>The CFP2050 includes the City's approaches to decarbonization and sustainability in the Facility Planning Principles section. The Plan references key documents, including the 2024 Portfolio Decarbonization Report, 2021 City of Redmond Operations Zero Carbon Strategy, 2020 Environmental Sustainability Action Plan, and works alongside with the 2025 Environmental Sustainability Action Plan (in development).</p>	<p>Opened 8/27/2025</p> <p>Closed 9/24/2025</p>																				

Item	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	<p>Redmond has adopted ambitious goals for city operations, including achieving net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2030. Redmond also participates in the King County-Cities Climate Collaborative (K4C), which calls for a 25% reduction in energy use in all existing buildings compared to 2012 levels by 2030. Additionally, all new facilities must meet LEED Gold or similar green building standards.</p>	
<p><b>3.</b></p> <p><b>Calculations</b></p> <p>Coleman</p>	<p><b><u>Commission Discussion</u></b></p> <p>From the 2019 Facilities Strategic Master Plan, how was it determined that 73% of facilities require investment by 2030?</p> <p><b><u>Staff Comments</u></b></p> <p>The 2019 Facilities Strategic Master Plan found that 73% of City facilities will require investment by 2030. This estimate is based on two factors: facility condition and functional performance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facility condition was evaluated by assessing whether a facility had no major needs, minor deficiencies, or required near-term investments.</li> <li>• Functional performance was evaluated by assessing whether a facility had no major needs, minor deficiencies, notable deficiencies, or required near-term investments.</li> </ul> <p>In general, facilities identified as needing near-term investments based on condition, or those with notable deficiencies or near-term investments required based on functional performance, were classified as facilities requiring investment by 2030.</p> <p>The CFP2050 incorporates findings from the 2023 Capital Facilities Condition Assessment, which informed the Facility Condition Index (FCI) – a measure of the relative condition of facilities. Overall, most Redmond facilities are in reasonably good condition, with exceptions at Fire Stations 11, 12, and 13, as well as significant issues at the Old Fire House Teen Center. The FCI results are provided in the CFP2050 beginning on page 30.</p>	<p>Opened 8/27/2025</p> <p>Closed 9/24/2025</p>
<p><b>4.</b></p> <p><b>Community Feedback</b></p> <p>Gagner</p>	<p><b><u>Commission Discussion</u></b></p> <p>How does community feedback from vulnerable populations specifically shape prioritization in the plan?</p>	<p>Opened 9/24/2025</p>

Item	Discussion Notes	Issue Status															
	<p><u>Staff Comments</u></p> <p>Community engagement for the Redmond 2050 Comprehensive Plan update spanned five years and involved robust outreach to vulnerable and underserved residents. Feedback gathered through this process directly informed both the policies adopted in the Comprehensive Plan’s Capital Facilities Element and the prioritization framework used in the Capital Facilities Plan (CFP 2050).</p> <p>Key themes raised by vulnerable populations and how they are addressed in the CFP 2050 include:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Community Feedback Theme</th> <th>Comprehensive Plan Policy Direction</th> <th>CFP 2050 Response</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>More inclusive facilities</td> <td>FW-CF-1 and CF-2 prioritize equitable access to public facilities</td> <td>CFP 2050 prioritizes investments in underserved communities and identifies deficiencies such as outdated gender-inappropriate features in older fire stations, recommending remodels or replacements (Section 3.2)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Safer facilities</td> <td>CF-6 emphasizes resilience and emergency preparedness CF-2 directs removal of physical and programmatic barriers</td> <td>CFP 2050 includes reinvestment and replacement of Fire and Police facilities and upgrades to life-safety systems across buildings (Section 1.2 - Emergency Preparedness and Resilience)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Improved accessibility</td> <td>CF-6 calls for decarbonization and sustainable building practices</td> <td>CFP 2050 integrates energy efficiency and greenhouse gas reduction into reinvestment and replacement strategies (Section 1.2 - Decarbonization and Sustainability)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Support for complete neighborhoods</td> <td>CF policies encourage service distribution based on geography and need</td> <td>New facilities are located strategically to serve underserved areas (Section 1.2 - Underserved Communities and Geographies)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Community Feedback Theme	Comprehensive Plan Policy Direction	CFP 2050 Response	More inclusive facilities	FW-CF-1 and CF-2 prioritize equitable access to public facilities	CFP 2050 prioritizes investments in underserved communities and identifies deficiencies such as outdated gender-inappropriate features in older fire stations, recommending remodels or replacements (Section 3.2)	Safer facilities	CF-6 emphasizes resilience and emergency preparedness CF-2 directs removal of physical and programmatic barriers	CFP 2050 includes reinvestment and replacement of Fire and Police facilities and upgrades to life-safety systems across buildings (Section 1.2 - Emergency Preparedness and Resilience)	Improved accessibility	CF-6 calls for decarbonization and sustainable building practices	CFP 2050 integrates energy efficiency and greenhouse gas reduction into reinvestment and replacement strategies (Section 1.2 - Decarbonization and Sustainability)	Support for complete neighborhoods	CF policies encourage service distribution based on geography and need	New facilities are located strategically to serve underserved areas (Section 1.2 - Underserved Communities and Geographies)	<p>Closed 10/8/2025</p>
Community Feedback Theme	Comprehensive Plan Policy Direction	CFP 2050 Response															
More inclusive facilities	FW-CF-1 and CF-2 prioritize equitable access to public facilities	CFP 2050 prioritizes investments in underserved communities and identifies deficiencies such as outdated gender-inappropriate features in older fire stations, recommending remodels or replacements (Section 3.2)															
Safer facilities	CF-6 emphasizes resilience and emergency preparedness CF-2 directs removal of physical and programmatic barriers	CFP 2050 includes reinvestment and replacement of Fire and Police facilities and upgrades to life-safety systems across buildings (Section 1.2 - Emergency Preparedness and Resilience)															
Improved accessibility	CF-6 calls for decarbonization and sustainable building practices	CFP 2050 integrates energy efficiency and greenhouse gas reduction into reinvestment and replacement strategies (Section 1.2 - Decarbonization and Sustainability)															
Support for complete neighborhoods	CF policies encourage service distribution based on geography and need	New facilities are located strategically to serve underserved areas (Section 1.2 - Underserved Communities and Geographies)															



Item	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	<p>More community and cultural spaces, especially for children and seniors</p> <p>CF-1 calls for facilities that support social connection and cultural expression</p> <p>CFP 2050 recommends facilities like the Overlake Community Center to address community space needs; additional demographic-specific strategies are informed by the PARCC Plan (Section 3.5 – Indoor Recreation)</p> <p>More information on the engagement process is available at: <a href="https://www.redmond.gov/1495/Engagement-Summaries">https://www.redmond.gov/1495/Engagement-Summaries</a>.</p> <p>In summary, the CFP 2050 does not just reference the Comprehensive Plan—it operationalizes its equity-focused policies by aligning capital investments with the expressed needs of vulnerable communities.</p>	
<p>5.</p> <p><b>Community Outreach</b></p> <p>Gagner</p>	<p><b><u>Commission Discussion</u></b></p> <p>How did the City do outreach to members in our community for whom English is not their first language?</p> <p><b><u>Staff Comments</u></b></p> <p>Outreach took place as part of the Redmond 2050 Comprehensive Plan update. Outreach occurred over 5 years and included extensive community engagement,. More information on the engagement process can be found here: <a href="https://www.redmond.gov/1495/Engagement-Summaries">https://www.redmond.gov/1495/Engagement-Summaries</a>&gt;</p> <p>Specifically, Commissioners are encouraged to review <a href="https://www.redmond.gov/DocumentCenter/View/32675/Community-Design-and-Equity-Engagement-Report---May-2024">https://www.redmond.gov/DocumentCenter/View/32675/Community-Design-and-Equity-Engagement-Report---May-2024</a> which summarizes outreach to different members of Redmond’s diverse community, including participation at Mid-Autumn and Spring Festivals events, as well as events for Cinco De Mayo and a workshop for Spanish speakers.</p> <p>In all cases, Redmond 2050 materials, such as posters, flyers, and advertisements were prepared in multiple languages. The Redmond city webpage, including the Redmond 2050 suite of pages, contained tools to enable translation in multiple languages.</p>	<p>Opened 9/24/2025</p> <p>Closed 10/8/2025</p>

Item	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
<p>6.</p> <p><b>Accessibility</b></p> <p>Gagner</p>	<p><b><u>Commission Discussion</u></b></p> <p>Accessibility is a factor that's mentioned in several sections... I'm not sure the full meaning of this word in the technical report - does it include ADA accessibility? As facilities are modernized or expanded, will the City ensure that ADA accessibility and universal design standards are met or exceeded (more specifically, is the goal to meet or to exceed)?</p> <p><b><u>Staff Comments</u></b></p> <p>Any improvements are required to meet ADA standards. In some scenarios they may be able to exceed ADA standards. However, that level of detail will be addressed in project design. The CFP2050 does not include project design.</p> <p>The high-level principles for Redmond’s capital facilities can be found in <a href="#">policy FW-CF-1</a>. These principles include building and maintaining facilities that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are resilient, sustainable, well designed, attractive and safe.</li> <li>• Protect public health and safety.</li> <li>• Result in the equitable and adequate provision of needed infrastructure and services.</li> </ul>	<p>Opened 9/24/2025</p> <p>Closed 10/8/2025</p>
<p>7.</p> <p><b>Emergency Response</b></p>	<p><b><u>Commission Discussion</u></b></p> <p>How does the plan address equitable emergency response times for neighborhoods with higher concentrations of renters, seniors, or low-income residents?</p> <p><b><u>Staff Comments</u></b></p> <p>Serving specific populations and geographies is analyzed and has recommendations in the Fire Functional Plan. This CFP is aligned with Fire's recommendations for fire station reinvestment to meet level of service.</p> <p><a href="#">Redmond Fire Department Functional Plan</a></p>	<p>Opened 9/24/2025</p> <p>Closed 10/8/2025</p>

Item	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
<p><b>8.</b></p> <p><b>Hazards</b></p> <p>Varadharajan</p>	<p><b><u>Commission Discussion</u></b></p> <p>Page 13 in the Summary of Hazards, can we consider adding extreme heat events to the list of potential risks?</p> <p><b><u>Staff Comments</u></b></p> <p>Staff recommends adding this term in the Planning Commission recommendation to Council.</p> <p><b><u>Commission Discussion 10.8.25</u></b></p> <p>Commissioners had further discussion and asked staff for clarification on the Commission’s role and process for recommendations per <a href="https://redmond.municipal.codes/RZC/21.76.060.L.3">https://redmond.municipal.codes/RZC/21.76.060.L.3</a>.</p> <p><b><u>Staff Comments 10.8.25</u></b></p> <p>Staff noted there is no concern with this addition and this term will be added to the Planning Commission recommendation to Council.</p>	<p>Opened 9/24/2025</p> <p>Closed 10/8/2025</p>
<p><b>9.</b></p> <p><b>Redmond 2050 Policies</b></p> <p>Varadharajan</p>	<p><b><u>Commission Discussion</u></b></p> <p>The key Capital Facilities Element and related policies should ideally include the following as well:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FW-CR-2 Ensure City services, infrastructure, and community members are resilient to climate impacts.</li> <li>• CR-10 Account for climate change impacts when planning, siting, designing, specifying building materials, and operating capital facility, utility, and infrastructure projects.</li> <li>• CR-11 Integrate local climate impact risk assessment findings and climate projections into hazard mitigation planning and other strategic plans.</li> <li>• CR-12 Factor climate impacts into the planning of operations and coordination of preparedness, response, and recovery activities.</li> </ul>	<p>Opened 9/24/2025</p> <p>Closed 10/8/2025</p>

Item	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	<p>Can we please consider adding this?</p> <p><b><u>Staff Comments</u></b></p> <p>Staff recommends that these policies will be included in the Planning Commission recommendation to Council.</p>	
<p>10.</p>	<p><b>Climate Resilient Materials</b></p> <p>Varadharajan</p> <p><b><u>Commission Discussion</u></b></p> <p>Based on the policies above and service levels associated with CF6, resilience of city infrastructure is key to keeping the city operational. Building for resilience is also building for sustainability. Therefore, durability especially of external materials and facades like concrete, cladding, and roofing materials are key. We cannot use standard specifications with changing climate conditions without factoring in increased operational and maintenance (O&amp;M) costs or costs for replacement within a shorter time. There are multiple questions on this issue:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Can we specifically add in text about building new standard specifications for city facilities that would be more resistant to climate change and more durable?</li> <li>b. Given the more frequent extreme weather events of extreme rain, heat, or cold, have the fundamental building specifications for exterior materials been revisited or evaluated to withstand these changing climate conditions?</li> <li>c. If not, can we add this as part of the plan for all capital facilities? There can be one study to build standard specs.</li> <li>d. Do the cost projections include more resilient material specifications?</li> <li>e. If not, can we have a disclosure in the plan that a study of more durable materials might increase costs for new construction/renovations but lower lifetime costs of O&amp;M and that will be published when the study is complete?</li> </ol> <p><b><u>Staff Comments</u></b></p> <p>The CFP2050 is a guiding document and does not design nor provide standards for the projects. Page 10 of the CFP2050 notes that it is a City goal that all new facilities are required to meet LEED Gold or a similar green building standard which could include provisions for materials used. Standard</p>	<p>Opened 9/24/2025</p> <p>Closed 10/8/2025</p>

Item	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	<p>specifications for facilities would be difficult as technology and materials advance over time, and material needs will vary based on the building type.</p> <p>The cost projections are based on similar projects in the market, which do not specify materials. More specific cost estimates for materials will take place during the design process.</p> <p>Staff recommends adding a sentence in section 1.2 to consider resilient materials. This would inform project design decisions when design occurs.</p> <p><b><u>Commission Discussion 10.8.25</u></b></p> <p>Commissioners had further discussion on how to best state the city’s commitment to using best practices for building materials that are resilient and sustainable.</p> <p>Commissioners also recommended that a statement be added to this section reiterating that the City will conduct climate vulnerability assessments as part of the design phase of facility construction.</p> <p><b><u>Staff Comments 10.8.25</u></b></p> <p>Staff will include the following text in the Planning Commission recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add a statement under Section 1.2 – Facility Planning Principles, under sub section “Other Sustainability Measures”:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <del>Consider opportunities to use</del> <i>Commit to integrating durable, climate-resilient materials with low-embodied carbon materials when designing and constructing new facilities</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• Add a statement under Section 1.2, under subsection “Other Sustainability Measures” regarding climate vulnerability assessments:                             <p><i>In the current Capital Investment Program (CIP), \$1.3M is set aside for citywide sustainability improvements including automation of HVAC controls and converting to LED lighting, and is \$1.7M is provided for electric vehicle charging equipment at the Municipal Parking Garage, Fire Station 11, and Fire Station 12. Moving forward, the City intends to incorporate sustainability</i></p> </li> </ul>	

Item	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	<p><i>improvements in all major projects for general government facilities <u>and to conduct a climate vulnerability assessment as part of the design phase of new facility construction.</u></i></p>	
<p><b>11. Formatting</b></p> <p>All</p>	<p><b><u>Commission Discussion</u></b></p> <p>Consider the following suggestions for improved user experience:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Link references and include page numbers</li> <li>b. Include more explanation on how the plan is organized</li> <li>c. Link referenced plans</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Staff Comments</u></b></p> <p>Final formatting with updated links will be completed for City Council adoption.</p>	<p>Opened 9/24/2025</p> <p>Closed 10/8/2025</p>
<p><b>12. Prioritization</b></p> <p>Coleman</p>	<p><b><u>Commission Discussion</u></b></p> <p>Why aren't fire stations prioritized?</p> <p><b><u>Staff Comments</u></b></p> <p>Fire facilities are a high priority, and the City must balance them along with other critical facility needs. The next major capital investment is the Maintenance and Operations Center (MOC), which Council has already approved in the current CIP cycle. The next major sets of investments are Fire Station 11 and 12. Additionally, the current budget includes investment into Fire Station 11 until its major remodel and renovations anticipated in the Medium-term project list.</p> <p>The Capital Facilities Plan includes all City facilities, not just Fire facilities. The project prioritization is based on criteria outlined in Section 4.2 Prioritization Criteria.</p>	<p>Opened 9/24/2025</p> <p>Closed 10/22/25</p>
<p><b>13. Financing</b></p> <p>Woodyear</p>	<p><b><u>Commission Discussion</u></b></p> <p>Are there guardrails or contingency for the funding sources?</p>	<p>Opened 9/24/2025</p> <p>Closed</p>

Item	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	<p><b><u>Staff Comments</u></b></p> <p>This is a high-level planning document intended to guide future investments.</p> <p>Under RCW requirements and Redmond 2050 Policy, CF-2 the plan is required to identify funding sources, which this plan fulfills.</p> <p>The funding sources and proportions shown on page 24 are estimates and do not represent committed funding. The estimates flow are based on reasonable assumptions about funding sources given historical data. Actual funding decisions will be made through the City's budget process for each project.</p> <p>Additionally, Redmond 2050 includes policies which addresses outside funding in the Capital facilities chapter.</p>	10/8/2025
<p><b>14.</b></p>	<p><b>Well 4</b></p> <p>Weston</p> <p><b><u>Commission Discussion</u></b></p> <p>Why is Well 4 only mentioned once in this plan?</p> <p><b><u>Staff Comments</u></b></p> <p>Well 4 is a water utility asset and planning for the water system is contained in the Water System Plan. It is mentioned in CFP 2050 only to note that it should be considered when redeveloping the Municipal Campus.</p> <p><b><u>Commission Discussion 10.8.25</u></b></p> <p>Commissioners recommended language under Section 3.7 - Municipal Campus Considerations, clarifying why on-site water facilities are considered and to reference back to the Water System Plan.</p> <p><b><u>Staff Comments 10.8.25</u></b></p> <p>Staff is working on modifications to the narrative on Campus Considerations and will be updated for the final draft.</p>	<p>Opened 9/24/2025</p> <p>Closed 10/8/2025</p>

Item	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
<p>15. <b>Emergency Preparedness</b></p> <p>Copley</p>	<p><b><u>Commission Discussion</u></b></p> <p>Emergency preparedness is noted as a continued need. What is the level of gravity for this need? Is our emergency preparedness sufficient?</p> <p><b><u>Staff Comments</u></b></p> <p>Addressing emergency preparedness is a requirement Redmond 2050 CF-2, and this plan fulfills that requirement. Redmond has adopted the <u>Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan 2023</u>, and guides the City’s approach to emergency preparedness. Page 11 gives a Hazard Assessment Summary and a Natural Hazard Risk Rating.</p>	<p>Opened 9/24/2025</p> <p>Closed 10/8/2025</p>
<p>16. <b>Revenue Sources</b></p> <p>Coleman</p>	<p><b><u>Commission Discussion</u></b></p> <p>Why does the Utility revenue source go from 27.9% from 2027-2032, to 0% in 2033-2040 and 2041-2050?</p> <p><b><u>Staff Comments</u></b></p> <p>The increase in Utility revenue between 2027–2032 reflects the anticipated redevelopment of the MOC, which is an eligible Utilities-funded project. Once construction is complete, no other projects in the plan are eligible to use Utilities revenue, which is why the share drops to 0% in the following timeframes (2033–2040 and 2041–2050).</p>	<p>Opened 9/24/2025</p> <p>Closed 10/22/2025</p>
<p>17. <b>Art Studio at Grass Lawn</b></p> <p>Weston</p>	<p><b><u>Commission Discussion</u></b></p> <p>Why is the Art Studio at Grass Lawn Park not included in this plan?</p> <p><b><u>Staff Comments</u></b></p> <p>The art studio is an ancillary Parks building, like restrooms, concessions and buildings at Farrel-McWhirter Park; this means they are not included in the General Government Facilities portfolio. Park ancillary buildings are maintained and operated through the Parks and Recreation department and is included in the PARCC Plan and funded through the Parks CIP.</p>	<p>Opened 9/24/2025</p> <p>Closed 10/8/2025</p>





NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING  
CITY OF REDMOND

**Redmond Comprehensive Plan Amendment:  
Capital Facilities Plan 2050 - General Government (LAND-2025-00239, SEPA-2020-00934)**

The City of Redmond Planning Commission will hold a Public Hearing at Redmond City Hall Council Chambers, 15670 NE 85th Street, Redmond, Washington on **October 8, 2025 at 7 p.m.** or as soon thereafter, on:

**SUBJECT:** The City of Redmond is proposing an amendment to the Capital Facilities Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan to include the Capital Facilities Plan 2050- General Government, adopted by reference.

**REQUESTED ACTION:** Planning Commission recommendation on the proposed amendment to the Redmond Comprehensive Plan.

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:** Join in-person at City Hall, watch live at [redmond.gov/RCTV](https://www.redmond.gov/RCTV), Comcast channel 21, Ziplly channel 34, on [facebook.com/CityofRedmond](https://www.facebook.com/CityofRedmond), or listen live by phone by calling 510-335-7371.

Public comment can be provided in-person at City Hall. Public comment can also be made by phone during the meeting by providing a name and phone number to [PlanningCommission@redmond.gov](mailto:PlanningCommission@redmond.gov) no later than 5 p.m. on the day of the hearing.

Written public comments should be submitted prior to the hearing by email to [PlanningCommission@redmond.gov](mailto:PlanningCommission@redmond.gov) no later than 5 p.m. on the hearing date. Comments may also be sent by mail to: Planning Commission, MS: 4SPL, P.O. Box 97010, Redmond, Washington, 98073-9710.

A copy of the proposal is available at <https://www.redmond.gov/2304/Capital-Facilities>.

If you have any comments, questions, or would like to be a Party-of-Record on this proposal, **please contact Cameron Zapata, Senior Parks Planner, 425-556-2328, [czapata@redmond.gov](mailto:czapata@redmond.gov).**

If you are hearing or visually impaired, please notify Planning Department staff at 425-556-2441 one week in advance of the hearing to arrange for assistance.

LEGAL NOTICE: September 17, 2025

**REDMOND PLANNING COMMISSION**

Susan Weston, Chair | Jeannine Woodyear, Vice-Chair  
Adam Coleman | Bryan Copley | Denice Gagner  
Tara Van Niman | Aparna Varadharajan

**MEETING MINUTES****REDMOND PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING****Wednesday, October 8, 2025 – 7:00 p.m.****1. Call to Order & Roll Call – 7:00 p.m.**

Commissioners Present: Chair Susan Weston, Vice-Chair Jeannine Woodyear (virtual), Commissioners Bryan Copley, Denice Gagner, and Aparna Varadharajan

Commissioners Excused: Commissioners Adam Coleman and Tara Van Niman

Staff Present: Odra Cardenas, Jeff Chuchill, Glenn Coil, Loreen Hamilton, Quinn Kuhnhausen (virtual), and Chris Wyatt

Recording Secretary: Carolyn Garza, LLC

- *Motion by Commissioner Copley to continue the Public Hearing for the Capital Facilities Plan 2050 to the October 22, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting unless the Hearing is concluded at this meeting. Motion seconded by Commission Aparna. The Motion passed unanimously.*

**2. Approval of the Agenda**

- *Motion to approve the Agenda by Commissioner Copley, seconded by Commissioner Aparna. The Motion passed.*

**3. Approval of Meeting Minutes & Summaries**

- *Motion by Commissioner Copley to approve the September 24, 2025 Meeting Summary. Motion seconded by Commissioner Aparna. The Motion passed unanimously.*

Redmond Planning Commission Meeting Minutes  
October 8, 2025

#### 4. Items from the Audience (General)

- **David Morton**, Redmond 98053, spoke regarding the draft 2025 Environmental Sustainability Action Plan Refresh, stated that clear discussion of implementation capacity and budget are missing, and asked how sustainability initiatives will compete with funding against fire stations, police facilities and operations centers. Recommendations were to prioritize actions by feasibility and impact, provide realistic staffing and budget projections, establish clear metrics and reporting schedules, and to strengthen connections to other city plans.

#### 5. Capital Facilities Plan 2050 - General Government (Public Hearing & Study Session)

Parks and Recreation (P & R) Director Loreen Hamilton introduced the Plan.

Commissioner Gagner joined the meeting.

##### *Public Hearing*

- **David Morton**, Redmond 98053, stated that the Plan currently lacks requirements for climate resilient building materials, and a proposed addition of the word *consider* rather than mandatory specifications is insufficient. The Hazard Summary on page 13 omits extreme heat events despite a documented increase and disproportionate impact on vulnerable populations. FWCR2 and CR10, 11 and 12 should explicitly be incorporated as well as climate assessments for major capital projects.

Chair Weston closed the verbal portion of the Public Hearing, leaving the written portion open.

##### *Study Session*

Senior Planner Coil presented the Issues Matrix. Issues one through three were closed at the previous Study Session.

Issues four through seven were closed by Commissioner Gagner. Chair Weston asked that the Issues be read for any other comments and there were none. Chair Weston asked that the name of Commissioner Gagner be added to Issue seven for the final packet.

Issue eight regarding hazards was explained. Commissioner Aparna asked for clarification regarding a recommendation to Council versus being incorporated into the Plan for Council. Senior Planner Coil replied that Council has the authority to either accept or reject Planning Commission recommendations, a legal process. Commissioner Aparna stated that extreme heat should be a part of the plan and not as simply a recommendation. Senior Planner Coil replied that all input is compiled for the Council report. Chair Weston stated that the process described has not always been followed and expressed the concern of Commissioner Aparna that the subject could be

Redmond Planning Commission Meeting Minutes  
October 8, 2025

missed by Council. Senior Planner Coil replied that all recommendations have always been highlighted for Council. Chair Weston stated there may have been process inconsistencies in the past and a recommendation might imply a different intensity. Commissioner Aparna stated that, for example, changes had been made to the Fire Functional Plan document by the Planning Commission, not recommendations, and not a deviation from the Plan. P & R Director Hamilton asked if adding the words *extreme heat* as an additional consideration to potential risk would satisfy the Matrix issue and asked Senior Planner Coil if there is a reason the text could not be adjusted. Senior Planner Coil replied that the issue is documentation and the ability of Council to see what the full conversation context was and explained how other Plan recommendations had been highlighted for Council. P & R Director Hamilton asked if a note stating that the words were added by recommendation of the Planning Commission could be sent to Council. Chair Weston stated that in past Plans such as Water and Park, there were redlines in the Plans, clearly edits but more integrated. P & R Director Hamilton asked for clarification that the change should be a part of the document prior to moving forward. Planning Manager Churchill replied that as a legal matter, a recommendation as a line in the Issues Matrix or in the Plan itself are the same. Chair Weston asked that an additional written reminder of the recommendation for Council be included if there are no redlines, emphasizing a strong opinion. Commissioner Aparna stated that at issue is the addition of verbiage, but the subject of extreme heat needs to be emphasized within the document. P & R Director Hamilton replied that what can be highlighted is that the Issues Matrix from the Planning Commission will reflect actual changes in language of the document. Commissioner Aparna stated being satisfied. Senior Planner Coil stated that the Planning Commission Chair can also reinforce the recommendation to the Council to emphasize importance. Senior Planner Coil stated that staff are compiling information to provide to a consultant. Commissioner Aparna asked that the issue be added to recommendations and that Issue number eight can be closed. Senior Planner Coil stated that the Planning Commission draft report will be available to confirm text.

Regarding Issue nine, Commissioner Aparna stated that the Issue could be closed, and P & R Director Hamilton confirmed that the recommendation would be added.

Regarding Issue 10, materials, Commissioner Aparna stated that the longevity and durability of infrastructure to be built must be considered. P & R Director Hamilton stated agreement, and that specific materials were not listed because the Plan is to extend to 2050 and technology will change, but the word *consider* can be strengthened. Commissioner Aparna asked that the Issue remain open until verbiage is settled on, in example, due diligence or Best Practice. Chair Weston suggested using *Best Practice to be resilient*. Facilities Manager Kuhnhausen suggested *commitment to resilient material*. Chair Weston stated that wording has been arrived at, *evaluating materials with a commitment to choosing materials that are resilient and sustainable*, and that including what is working well is important for future staff and P & R Director Hamilton stated agreement. Commissioner Aparna stated that if wording is changed

Redmond Planning Commission Meeting Minutes  
October 8, 2025

and added to the recommendation the Issue could be closed and added that LEED is not a convincing argument because of the point system used and not an outcome.

Senior Planner Coil stated that the Issue 11 regarding format has been communicated to the consultant. Chair Weston asked that a note be added stating that the specific issue was within the introduction, for clarity, and that the Issue could be closed.

Regarding Issue 12, prioritization, the upcoming Maintenance and Operations Center project will be the highest cost project in city history using the majority of capital for the next four to five years, fire stations and public safety building to follow. Chair Weston stated that the Issue should remain open until Commissioner Coleman is present. Senior Planner Coil stated that the Fire Functional Plan and Capital Facilities Plan have advanced projects into the pipeline.

Regarding Issue 13, financing, Vice-Chair Woodyear stated being satisfied with the response and that the issue could be closed.

Regarding Issue 14, Well Four, Chair Weston stated that the issue should be added to recommendations and with a cross link for clarity of boundaries. P & R Director Hamilton asked if specifying that the Well is mentioned because of the proximity to general government facilities on the municipal campus should occur and Chair Weston stated agreement and that the issue could be closed.

Regarding Issue 15, emergency preparedness, Commissioner Copley asked why emergency preparedness would be brought up specifically as a continuing need if only another component. P & R Director Hamilton replied that emergency preparedness is always part of any conversation regarding facilities, a continued need regardless of new building, rebuilding, or renovation. Commissioner Copley asked if context could be added to verbiage. Chair Weston asked for a page number, and Commissioner Copley replied that the Issue is from the slide presentation given at the last session and not Plan text. P & R Director Hamilton stated that the text section can be reviewed and brought back to ensure clarity. Chair Weston asked Commissioner Copley to find and review the section and email staff with edits or to close, being mindful of meeting scheduling. Commissioner Copley replied that Planner Cardenas would be contacted by end of business tomorrow, October 9, 2025.

Issue 16 is a question from Commissioner Coleman who was not present to close.

Chair Weston stated that Issue 17 could be closed.

Commissioner Aparna added an Issue, to address climate vulnerability assessments for all large capital projects. P & R Director Hamilton replied that climate vulnerability is always a part of the process and that verbiage in the Plan can be included to confirm commitment. Chair Weston asked if the Issue should be combined with Issue ten, Materials. Commissioner Aparna replied [inaudible - away from microphone]. Chair Weston suggested creating an Issue 10 A.

Senior Planner Coil stated that the formal recommendations will be available at the next meeting.

Redmond Planning Commission Meeting Minutes  
October 8, 2025

## 6. Staff & Commissioner Updates

Planner Cardenas stated that the next Study Sessions are on October 22, 2025 for the Capital Facilities Plan and Transportation Master Plan update, as well as a Briefing on the Economic Development Business Improvement Code Package.

Planner Cardenas asked to be informed of any attendance issues.

## 7. Adjourn

- Motion to adjourn at 7:57 p.m. by Commissioner Copley, seconded by Commissioner Aparna. The Motion passed.

Minutes approved on:

10/22/2025

Planning Commission Chair

Signed by:  
*Susan L. Weston*  
2E66B184628E4A6...  
Susan Weston

I'm providing feedback on the [Capital Facilities Plan 2050](#) before your recommendation to Council.

This plan will guide [nearly \\$1 billion in infrastructure investments over 25 years](#). I appreciate the [comprehensive facility assessment](#) and strategic approach. However, climate resilience integration needs strengthening.

The [plan currently lacks requirements for climate-resilient building materials](#). While [page 12 mentions considering low-embodied carbon materials](#), there's nothing about requiring materials that withstand extreme weather conditions that we can already predict, such as intense heat, heavier precipitation, and more severe storms. The Issues Matrix shows Commissioner Aparna raised this concern, and [staff proposes adding language to "consider resilient materials" in Section 1.2](#).

However, the word "consider" is insufficient. Without mandatory specifications for exterior materials like concrete, cladding, and roofing that meet climate projections, each project team will independently decide whether to prioritize resilience. This risks inconsistent protection, premature material failure, higher lifecycle costs, and service disruptions when facilities can't withstand conditions they'll inevitably face.

Additionally, the [hazards summary on page 13](#) omits **extreme heat** events despite their documented increase and disproportionate impact on vulnerable populations. This gap should be corrected.

[The Issues Matrix also shows staff will incorporate key climate resilience policies, specifically FW-CR-2, CR-10, CR-11, and CR-12](#), which I strongly support. These policies [require integrating climate risk assessments into facility planning](#), not treating climate considerations as optional.

The Planning Commission's recommendation to Council should include:

- Requiring mandatory climate-resilient material specifications, not suggestions to "consider" them,
- Including **extreme heat** in hazard assessments,
- Confirming that policies [FW-CR-2](#), [CR-10](#), [CR-11](#), and [CR-12](#) are explicitly incorporated as staff indicated, and
- Requiring climate vulnerability assessments for major capital projects.

These facilities will serve Redmond for 50-plus years. Building to yesterday's climate conditions guarantees premature deterioration and higher costs.

To achieve its sustainability goals, Redmond should require climate-resilient design. Please ensure that your recommendation establishes mandatory requirements, not voluntary considerations.

## Written Public Comment

**From:** David Morton <davidwardmorton@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 7, 2025 11:03 PM  
**To:** Planning Commission  
**Cc:** Odra Cardenas; Glenn Coil; Jeff Churchill; Ian Lefcourte; Carol Helland; Lauren Alpert; Aaron Bert; Loreen Hamilton; Darrell Lowe; Adrian Sheppard; Kelley Cochran; Cameron Zapata; Lindsey Falkenburg; Quinn Kuhnhausen; Ameer Quiriconi; Micheal Despain (MED Enterprises); Brian Coats; Erica Chua; David Tucheck; Chris Stenger; twilkinson@redmond.gov; bmclain@redmond.gov; syeager@redmond.gov; redwardsen@redmond.gov; Hailey Zurcher; Blake Ruiz; Haritha Narra; Beckye Frey; Jenny Lybeck; Susan Weston (City Volunteer); Jeannine Woodyear (City Volunteer); Adam Coleman (City Volunteer); Bryan Copley (City Volunteer); Denice Gagner (City Volunteer); Tara Van Niman (City Volunteer); Aparna Varadharajan (City Volunteer); Seraphie Allen; Jessica Atlatson; Lauren Anderson; Aaron Moldver; Micah Bonkowski; Valeria Cosgrove; Erin O'Mara; Sustainability; Tess Larson; Michael Hintze; Francesca Liburdy; PLAN - Redmond 2050 - Technical Advisory Committee; Ernest C. Fix; Malisa Files; Vanessa Kritzer; gwolff@redmond.gov; Oneredmond Info; Kim Dietz; eugene.radcliff@ecy.wa.gov; Tim McHarg; David Lee; Todd Rawlings; Brian Buck; Brian Collins (GWS); Cameron Barajas; Tom W. Hardy; Gary Smith; Arielle Dorman; Redmond 2050; Kim Faust; Marilyn Lazaro (City Volunteer); Tom Hitzroth; Yeni Li; Tom Markl - Economic Development Board of Directors; Phil Miller; Ray Sayers; Madeline Schroeder; Steve Yoon; Kelli Refer; Sol Dressa; rays@plot-design.com; Tayler Smith; Sean Canady; Mike Brent; Andrea Martin; Patrick Journey; Amanda Balzer; Chip Cornwell; pwilliams@redmond.gov; Jill E. Smith; Rheya Wren; Mike Behn; Andy Swayne; Rachel Molloy; David Hoffman; Katie Pratt; Erik Bedell; Chryssa Gardner - OPTVVA; Zwanzig, Macy; Marilyn Subala; Jones, Karissa; Rheya Wren; Caitlin Reck; Michael Vermeulen; Nancy T. Logan; Esha Mehta; dcarson@redmondpolicefoundation.org; James Terwilliger; Dave Otis; Michael Johnson; jor\_mig\_santos@hotmail.com; saanvibathla@outlook.com; tammyvupham@icloud.com; Jack W. Anderson (Americorps); Anastasiya Warhol; David Baker; Jon Culver; Milton Curtis; Joe Marshall; Andrew McClung; Melanie OCain; Brian Stewart; David Barnes; Debra Srebnik; City Hall; Corina Pfeil; Corina Pfeil; Brombaugh; Rodgers Darrell (EHS Director); Kelly McGourty; Boyte-White Claire (ECY); bob@northshorenews.com; Matthew Tejada; Rod Dembowski; Sheryl Stohs; Rebecca Chu; Christie True; Shannon Braddock; Shannon Braddock; Alessandro Molina; Jason Lynch; Nigel Herbig; Brandon Leyritz; Philly Marsh; Ewing, Jennifer; Fall, Sofia; hardy.joan5@gmail.com; Lisa Rigg; adettelbach@redmond.gov; Jeff Thompson; Peter Holte; Marissa Aho; carly.bouton@kingcounty.gov; claudia.balducci@kingcounty.gov; sarah.perry@kingcounty.gov; info@prideacrossthebridge.org; Axton Burton  
**Subject:** "Items from the Audience" and Public Hearing on "Capital Facilities Plan 2050 – General Government," 2 comments at the Redmond Planning Commission meeting on 10/8/25 by David Morton



**Attachments:** [Seventieth talk to Redmond Planning Commission.docx](#); [Seventy first talk to Redmond Planning Commission.docx](#)

**External Email Warning!** Use caution before clicking links or opening attachments.

Dear Redmond Planning Commissioners:

I wish to provide 2 spoken public comments: the first during "Items from the Audience" and the second during the Public Hearing on "Capital Facilities Plan 2050 – General Government" ([Agenda Item 5](#)) in the [October 8, 2025, meeting](#) of the Redmond Planning Commission.

I plan to be present at City Hall on October 8 to present my public comments in person at the podium.

My comments are attached as Word documents (containing [blue and underlined hyperlinks](#)) and are inserted in the body of this email below:

**★★★★The Following Is My First 3 Minute Public Comment for Items from the Audience★★★★**

I'm providing feedback on the [draft 2025 Environmental Sustainability Action Plan Refresh](#).

I appreciate the City's commitment to ambitious sustainability goals. But the plan's feasibility is concerning, given resource constraints and competing priorities.

The plan proposes expanding initiatives across multiple domains—increasing tree canopy to 40%, [transitioning the municipal fleet to electric vehicles](#), [retrofitting buildings for energy efficiency](#), and more. But it lacks clear discussion of implementation capacity. Who will manage these initiatives? The plan mentions hiring staff but doesn't specify positions, timelines, or whether funding is secured. Without dedicated personnel, these initiatives might stall or fall to already overburdened existing staff.

The financial analysis is similarly unclear. While some actions note potential funding sources, there's no comprehensive budget showing total costs versus available resources. This is especially concerning given the Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) 2050's projection of nearly \$1 billion in infrastructure spending. How will sustainability initiatives compete for funding against fire stations, police facilities, and operations centers? The plan should acknowledge these trade-offs.

Here are some recommendations:

First, prioritize actions by feasibility and impact. Not everything can happen simultaneously. Which initiatives offer the greatest emissions reductions per dollar spent? Which are prerequisites for others?

## Written Public Comment

Second, provide realistic staffing and budget projections. If full implementation requires positions that aren't funded, state that explicitly. If certain actions depend on grant funding that's uncertain, acknowledge that risk.

Third, establish clear metrics and reporting schedules. [The plan mentions tracking progress](#) but doesn't commit to regular public updates. Annual reporting to the Council and community would ensure accountability.

Fourth, strengthen connections to other City plans. The CFP will drive significant emissions—from construction, materials, and facility operations. The sustainability plan should explicitly address how to influence those decisions.

I support Redmond's sustainability ambitions, but results may be disappointing without implementation planning. Before adoption, this plan needs realistic resource assessment, clear prioritization, and honest acknowledgment of trade-offs.

★★★ End of My First 3 Minute Public Comment ★★★

★★★ The Following Is My Public Comment on [Agenda Item 5](#) ★★★



I'm providing feedback on the [Capital Facilities Plan 2050](#) before your recommendation to Council.

This plan will guide [nearly \\$1 billion in infrastructure investments over 25 years](#). I appreciate the [comprehensive facility assessment](#) and strategic approach. However, climate resilience integration needs strengthening.

The [plan currently lacks requirements for climate-resilient building materials](#). While [page 12 mentions considering low-embodied carbon materials](#), there's nothing about requiring materials that withstand extreme weather conditions that we can already predict, such as intense heat, heavier precipitation, and more severe storms. The Issues Matrix shows Commissioner Aparna raised this concern, and [staff proposes adding language to "consider resilient materials" in Section 1.2](#).

However, the word "consider" is insufficient. Without mandatory specifications for exterior materials like concrete, cladding, and roofing that meet climate projections, each project team will independently decide whether to prioritize resilience. This risks inconsistent protection, premature material failure, higher lifecycle costs, and service disruptions when facilities can't withstand conditions they'll inevitably face.

Additionally, the [hazards summary on page 13](#) omits **extreme heat** events despite their documented increase and disproportionate impact on vulnerable populations. This gap should be corrected.

[The Issues Matrix also shows staff will incorporate key climate resilience policies, specifically FW-CR-2, CR-10, CR-11, and CR-12](#), which I strongly support. These policies [require integrating climate risk assessments into facility planning](#), not treating climate considerations as optional.

The Planning Commission's recommendation to Council should include:

- Requiring mandatory climate-resilient material specifications, not suggestions to "consider" them,
- Including **extreme heat** in hazard assessments,
- Confirming that policies [FW-CR-2](#), [CR-10](#), [CR-11](#), and [CR-12](#) are explicitly incorporated as staff indicated, and
- Requiring climate vulnerability assessments for major capital projects.

These facilities will serve Redmond for 50-plus years. Building to yesterday's climate conditions guarantees premature deterioration and higher costs.

To achieve its sustainability goals, Redmond should require climate-resilient design. Please ensure that your recommendation establishes mandatory requirements, not voluntary considerations.

★ ★ ★ End of My Public Comments ★ ★ ★

Sincerely,

David Morton, PhD  
Redmond 98053  
206-909-5680



## TECHNICAL COMMITTEE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION

September 17, 2025

<b>Project File Number:</b>	<b>LAND-2025-00239; SEPA-2020-00934</b>	
<b>Proposal Name:</b>	<b>Redmond 2050 Comprehensive Plan Amendment - Incorporate Capital Facilities Plan 2050- General Government into Capital Facilities Element</b>	
<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>City of Redmond</b>	
<b>Staff Contacts:</b>	Cameron Zapata, Senior Park Planner	425-556-2328
	Quinn Kuhnhausen, Facilities Manager	425-556-2716
	Glenn Coil, Senior Planner	425-556-2742

### TECHNICAL COMMITTEE COMPLIANCE REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION

Technical Committee shall make a recommendation to the Planning Commission for all Type VI reviews (RZC 21.76.060.E). The Technical Committee's recommendation shall be based on the decision criteria set forth in the Redmond Zoning Code. Review Criteria:

- A. *RZC 21.76.070.J Comprehensive Plan Amendment*

### REDMOND COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT SUMMARY

This amendment to the Capital Facilities element of the Redmond 2050 Comprehensive Plan will incorporate, by reference, the Capital Facilities Plan 2050- General Government (CFP). Per Comprehensive Plan Policy CF-3, functional plans - or portions of functional plans - are adopted into the Comp Plan when they are used to fulfill Growth Management Act requirements.

The CFP supports and implements the vision of the Redmond 2050 Comprehensive Plan by ensuring Redmond has the facilities it needs to serve the community today and into the future. It prioritizes needs and recommends investments in Fire, Police, Public Works, Park Operations, Park Recreation and Administration facilities over the next 25 years.

This plan updates and supersedes the Capital Facilities Plan 2025-30: General Government Facilities by extending the planning horizon to 2050.

<b>RZC 21.76.070.J COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT CRITERIA</b> <i>(Full staff analysis attached as Attachment A)</i>		<b>MEETS/ DOES NOT MEET</b>
a.	Consistency with the Growth Management Act (GMA), the State of Washington Department of Commerce Procedural Criteria, Vision 2050 or its successor, and the King County Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs).	Meets
b.	Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan policies and the designation criteria.	Meets
c.	Potential impacts to vulnerable community members.	Meets
d.	Consistency with the preferred growth and development pattern of the Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan;	Meets
e.	Potential impacts to the ability of the City to provide equitable access to services.	Meets
f.	Potential impacts to the natural environment, such as impacts to critical areas and other natural resources.	Meets
g.	The capability of the land for development, including the prevalence of environmentally critical areas.	N/A
h.	Whether the proposed land use designations or uses are compatible with nearby land use designations or uses.	N/A
i.	If the amendment proposes a change in allowed uses in an area, the need for the land uses that would be allowed and whether the change would result in the loss of the capacity to accommodate other needed land uses.	N/A
j.	Consistency with the preferred growth and development pattern in the Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan.	Meets
k.	The proposed amendment addresses significantly changed conditions. In making this determination the following shall be considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Unanticipated consequences of an adopted policy; or</li> <li>ii. Changed conditions on the subject property or its surrounding area; or</li> <li>iii. Changes related to the pertinent plan map or text; and</li> <li>iv. Where such change of conditions creates conflicts in the Comprehensive Plan of a magnitude that would need to be addressed for the Comprehensive Plan to function as an integrated whole.</li> </ul>	Meets

## ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (EIS)

The Capital Facilities Plan 2050- General Government is being updated as part of the Redmond 2050 Comprehensive Plan update.

The lead agency for this proposal has determined that the periodic update to the Redmond Comprehensive Plan, known as Redmond 2050, is likely to have a significant adverse impact on the environment. An environmental impact statement (EIS) is required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(c). An EIS scoping period was held from October 12 to November 25, 2020. A draft EIS was issued June 16, 2022 and a comment period for the draft EIS was open through August 26, 2022. A supplemental draft EIS was published on September 20, 2023 and a comment period for the supplemental draft EIS was open through October 20, 2022. A final EIS was published on December 15, 2023. Additional information can be found at <http://www.redmond.gov/1442/Documents> under tab "Environmental Review."

---

## STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on the compliance review of the decision criteria set forth in

A. *RZC 21.76.070.J Comprehensive Plan Amendment*

Staff recommends **approval** of the proposed amendment. Staff compliance review and analysis is provided in Attachment A.

---

## TECHNICAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Technical Committee has reviewed the proposed amendments identified in Attachment B, and finds the amendments to be **consistent** with review criteria identified below:

A. *RZC 21.76.070 Criteria for Evaluation and Action.*

---

## REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY



Carol Helland,  
Planning and Community Development Director



Aaron Bert,  
Public Works Director

## Attachments

- A. Staff Compliance Review and Analysis
- B. Capital Facilities Plan 2050- General Government



**ATTACHMENT A: STAFF COMPLIANCE REVIEW AND ANALYSIS**  
**Capital Facilities Plan 2050- General Government**  
**LAND-2025-00239; SEPA-2020-00934**

**Comprehensive Plan Amendment Review Criteria (RZC 21.76.070.J.9)**

CRITERIA		ANALYSIS									
a.	Consistency with the Growth Management Act (GMA), the State of Washington Department of Commerce Procedural Criteria, Vision 2050 or its successor, and the King County Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs).	The Capital Facilities Plan 2050- General Government (CFP2050) is consistent with GMA and addresses related requirements for capital facilities at RCW 36.70A.070.3, including:									
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Capital Facilities Element Requirement</th> <th>Where addressed in Plan</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>(a) An inventory of existing capital facilities owned by public entities, showing the locations and capacities of the capital facilities;</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 2, Section 3</li> </ul> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) a forecast of the future needs for such capital facilities;</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 3</li> </ul> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) the proposed locations and capacities of expanded or new capital facilities;</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 3, Section 4</li> </ul> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) at least a six-year plan that will finance such capital facilities within projected funding capacities and clearly identifies sources of public money for such purposes; and</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 1, Section 4</li> </ul> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Capital Facilities Element Requirement	Where addressed in Plan	(a) An inventory of existing capital facilities owned by public entities, showing the locations and capacities of the capital facilities;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 2, Section 3</li> </ul>	(b) a forecast of the future needs for such capital facilities;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 3</li> </ul>	(c) the proposed locations and capacities of expanded or new capital facilities;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 3, Section 4</li> </ul>	(d) at least a six-year plan that will finance such capital facilities within projected funding capacities and clearly identifies sources of public money for such purposes; and
Capital Facilities Element Requirement	Where addressed in Plan										
(a) An inventory of existing capital facilities owned by public entities, showing the locations and capacities of the capital facilities;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 2, Section 3</li> </ul>										
(b) a forecast of the future needs for such capital facilities;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 3</li> </ul>										
(c) the proposed locations and capacities of expanded or new capital facilities;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 3, Section 4</li> </ul>										
(d) at least a six-year plan that will finance such capital facilities within projected funding capacities and clearly identifies sources of public money for such purposes; and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 1, Section 4</li> </ul>										
b.	Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan policies and the designation criteria.	The CFP2050 relies on Comprehensive Plan growth projections and directly supports and implements Comprehensive Plan Policies in the Capital Facilities and Climate Resilience and Sustainability elements. The most pertinent policies include FW-CF-1, CF-2 as described in detail below, CF-6, CF-18 and CR-39. The plan also supports land Use policies LU-2 and LU-12.									



		<p>The CFP2050, along with its associated capital projects and improvements, aligns with the City’s land use planning, zoning, and growth development patterns.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><b>Consistency with Capital Facilities Policy CF-2</b></th> <th><b>Where addressed in Plan</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A description of the current capital facility infrastructure, including green infrastructure, and the scope and cost of its operation and maintenance;</td> <td>Section 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 3 and 4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>A description of current capital facility deficiencies and appropriate strategies to remedy these deficiencies;</td> <td>Section 2.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>An analysis of capital facilities needed through the year 2050, and preliminary cost estimates to meet those needs;</td> <td>Section 1.2 and 3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>An analysis specifying how capital facilities will be financed and maintained;</td> <td>Section 1.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>A description of the functional plan’s public outreach, participation and review process;</td> <td>Section 1.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Criteria to be used to prioritize projects and inform the Capital Investment Strategy;</td> <td>Section 4.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>An analysis of how proposed investments impact underserved communities and geographies;</td> <td>Section 1.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>A description of how the plan addresses emergency preparedness and resilience to natural hazards, including climate change impacts;</td> <td>Section 1.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>A description of how the functional plan and supporting documents fulfill Growth Management Act requirements; and</td> <td>Section 1.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>An analysis indicating that the functional plan, including any subsequent revisions or modifications, is consistent with Comprehensive Plan policies, Zoning Code regulations, and applicable state and federal laws.</td> <td>Section 1.1 and 1.6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>Consistency with Capital Facilities Policy CF-2</b>	<b>Where addressed in Plan</b>	A description of the current capital facility infrastructure, including green infrastructure, and the scope and cost of its operation and maintenance;	Section 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 3 and 4	A description of current capital facility deficiencies and appropriate strategies to remedy these deficiencies;	Section 2.2	An analysis of capital facilities needed through the year 2050, and preliminary cost estimates to meet those needs;	Section 1.2 and 3	An analysis specifying how capital facilities will be financed and maintained;	Section 1.4	A description of the functional plan’s public outreach, participation and review process;	Section 1.5	Criteria to be used to prioritize projects and inform the Capital Investment Strategy;	Section 4.2	An analysis of how proposed investments impact underserved communities and geographies;	Section 1.2	A description of how the plan addresses emergency preparedness and resilience to natural hazards, including climate change impacts;	Section 1.2	A description of how the functional plan and supporting documents fulfill Growth Management Act requirements; and	Section 1.1	An analysis indicating that the functional plan, including any subsequent revisions or modifications, is consistent with Comprehensive Plan policies, Zoning Code regulations, and applicable state and federal laws.	Section 1.1 and 1.6
<b>Consistency with Capital Facilities Policy CF-2</b>	<b>Where addressed in Plan</b>																							
A description of the current capital facility infrastructure, including green infrastructure, and the scope and cost of its operation and maintenance;	Section 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 3 and 4																							
A description of current capital facility deficiencies and appropriate strategies to remedy these deficiencies;	Section 2.2																							
An analysis of capital facilities needed through the year 2050, and preliminary cost estimates to meet those needs;	Section 1.2 and 3																							
An analysis specifying how capital facilities will be financed and maintained;	Section 1.4																							
A description of the functional plan’s public outreach, participation and review process;	Section 1.5																							
Criteria to be used to prioritize projects and inform the Capital Investment Strategy;	Section 4.2																							
An analysis of how proposed investments impact underserved communities and geographies;	Section 1.2																							
A description of how the plan addresses emergency preparedness and resilience to natural hazards, including climate change impacts;	Section 1.2																							
A description of how the functional plan and supporting documents fulfill Growth Management Act requirements; and	Section 1.1																							
An analysis indicating that the functional plan, including any subsequent revisions or modifications, is consistent with Comprehensive Plan policies, Zoning Code regulations, and applicable state and federal laws.	Section 1.1 and 1.6																							
c.	Potential impacts to vulnerable community members.	The CFP2050 forecasts future capital facility needs based on Comprehensive Plan growth targets to 2050, providing a framework for planning and prioritizing investments, focusing resources, acquiring property, and pursuing partnership opportunities. Without strategic investment in City facilities, vulnerable community members may face reduced access to services and lower service levels, such as slower emergency response times.																						

d.	Potential economic impacts.	Anticipated economic impacts for the CFP2050 will be both direct and indirect. This includes creating jobs through hiring of contractors, consultants and staff to complete the anticipated investment projects. Indirect economic impacts may result from meeting level of service standards for those services that operate out of the General Government Facilities. Increased level of service benefits residents through improved quality of life and safety. Businesses could see economic gains as high-quality public services and amenities help attract and retain a skilled workforce, while property owners may benefit from stabilized or increased property values due to enhanced community services. For City of Redmond, planned investments will reduce long-term maintenance costs, improve operational efficiency, and provide more predictable financial planning.
e.	Potential impacts to the ability of the City to provide equitable access to services.	The CFP2050 guides investment to support services necessary to maintain city functions, and will be preserved and in some cases, enhanced. Facilities will maintain their accessibility and be distributed to meet the needs of the growing City. Modernizing and expanding capacity where needed, the City will be better positioned to provide equitable access to services to all.
f.	Potential impacts to the natural environment, such as impacts to critical areas and other natural resources.	No anticipated impacts to the natural environment or critical areas are anticipated. Any new construction arising from this plan will comply with federal, state and local environmental and critical areas codes. Future projects described in the plan will also be expected to meet then-current sustainable building practices and site design that support Redmond's environmental goals, such as energy efficiency, tree retention, and stormwater management.
g.	The capability of the land for development, including the prevalence of environmentally critical areas.	This amendment does not propose any changes in land use. Any new construction will comply with federal, state and local environmental and critical areas codes.
h.	Whether the proposed land use designations or uses are compatible with nearby land use designations or uses.	No changes to land use designations are proposed as a part of this comprehensive plan amendment.
i.	If the amendment proposes a change in allowed uses in an area, the need for the land uses that would be allowed and whether the change would result	N/A. This criterion is not applicable to this amendment.

	<p>in the loss of the capacity to accommodate other needed land uses.</p>	
<p>j.</p>	<p>Consistency with the preferred growth and development pattern in the Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan.</p>	<p>The CFP2050 is a functional plan that guides the City’s capital investments to align with and implement the growth strategy and land use vision established in Redmond 2050.</p>
<p>k.</p>	<p>The proposed amendment addresses significantly changed conditions. In making this determination the following shall be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Unanticipated consequences of an adopted policy; or</li> <li>ii. Changed conditions on the subject property or its surrounding area; or</li> <li>iii. Changes related to the pertinent plan map or text; and</li> <li>iv. Where such change of conditions creates conflicts in the Comprehensive Plan of a magnitude that would need to be addressed for the Comprehensive Plan to function as an integrated whole.</li> </ul>	<p>The CFP2050 incorporates updated analyses of facility conditions and considers the City’s growth targets in alignment with Redmond 2050. Investments for capital facilities are identified to maintain and expand services to accommodate that growth.</p>



# CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN 2050 – GENERAL GOVERNMENT

CITY OF REDMOND  
2027 - 2050

DRAFT | SEPTEMBER 2025



---

# Acknowledgements

Mayor Angela Birney

## City Council

Vanessa Kritzer, President  
Jessica Forsythe, Vice President  
Jeralee Anderson  
Steve Fields  
Angie Nuevacamina  
Osman Salahuddin  
Melissa Stuart

## Planning Commission

Susan Weston, Chair  
Jeannine Woodyear, Vice-Chair  
Adam Coleman  
Bryan Copley  
Denice Gagner  
Tara Van Niman  
Aparna Varadharajan

## Functional Area Department Directors

Aaron Bert, Public Works Director  
Loreen Hamilton, Parks and Recreation  
Darrell Lowe, Police Chief  
Adrian Sheppard, Fire Chief  
Kelley Cochran, Finance  
Carol Helland, Planning and  
Community Development

## Project Team

Cameron Zapata  
Loreen Hamilton  
Lindsey Falkenburg  
Glenn B. Coil  
Quinn Kuhnhausen

## Subject Matter Experts

Ameé Quiriconi, Fire  
Mike Despain, Fire  
Brian Coates, Police  
Erica Chua, Parks and Recreation  
Darcey Rayner-Shepard, Parks and Recreation  
David Tuchek, Parks and Recreation  
Chris Stanger, Public Works  
Tess Wilkinson, Public Works  
Betsie McLain, Public Works  
Sandy Yeager, Finance  
Ryan Edwardsen, Finance  
Hailey Zurcher, Finance  
Blake Ruiz, Finance  
Haritha Narra, Finance  
Jeff Churchill, Planning and Community  
Development  
Beckye Frey, Planning and Community  
Development  
Jenny Lybeck, Environmental Sustainability

## Consultant Team

MAKERS Architecture & Urban Design LLP  
Julie Bassuk, Scott Bonjukian,  
Arman Sufi, Cecilia Roussel  
ACC Cost Consultants  
Terence Walton, Todd Slater

---

# Table of Contents

<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>1 – Planning Context</b> .....	<b>5</b>
1.1 – Capital Facilities Planning Requirements.....	5
1.2 – Facility Planning Principles .....	10
1.2 – General Government Facilities Plan Scope .....	20
1.3 – Summary of Costs .....	22
1.4 – Funding for Capital Investment .....	23
1.5 – Planning Process .....	24
1.6 – Zoning Analysis.....	26
<b>2 – Portfolio Overview</b> .....	<b>28</b>
2.1 – Introduction .....	28
2.2 – Facility Condition Assessment.....	30
2.3 – Qualitative Facility Rankings .....	34
2.4 – Service Life.....	36
<b>3 – Existing Conditions and Recommendations</b> .....	<b>37</b>
3.1 – Introduction .....	37
3.2 – Fire .....	37
3.3 – Police.....	54
3.4 – Maintenance & Operations .....	60
3.5 – Indoor Recreation .....	64
3.6 – Administration.....	73
3.7 – Municipal Campus Considerations .....	77
<b>4 – Capital Investment Strategy</b> .....	<b>81</b>
4.1 – Introduction .....	82
4.2 – Prioritization Criteria .....	82
4.3 – Cost Estimates Overview.....	83
4.4 – Near-Term Actions (2025-2032).....	85
4.5 – Medium-Term Actions (2033-2040).....	88
4.6 – Long-Term Actions (2041-2050).....	90
4.7 – Beyond 2050 .....	91

---

# Introduction

Redmond's Capital Facilities Plan 2050 – General Government (CFP) aims to ensure the City of Redmond will have the facilities it needs to serve the community today and into the future. It prioritizes needs and recommends investments in Fire, Police, Maintenance & Operations, Indoor Recreation, and Administration facilities over the next 25 years.

As major facility investments can take years to accomplish and require complex community engagement, design, and funding processes, this CFP sets the framework for the City to plan for needed investments, focus resources, acquire needed property, and leverage partnership opportunities. This Plan supports and implements the vision of the Redmond 2050 Comprehensive Plan and is adopted by Council by reference into the Capital Facilities Element to fulfill Growth Management Act and City requirements for capital facilities planning. This plan also updates and extends the planning horizon of the [2025-2030 Capital Facilities Plan](#) to 2050.

The report is organized into four sections:

- **Planning Context** introduces the regulatory requirements that guide this CFP, Redmond's municipal facilities, and this portfolio-wide assessment
- **Portfolio Overview** covers citywide facility information, the facility condition assessment, facility rankings, and service life information
- **Existing Conditions and Recommendations** covers major issues, facility condition ratings, alternatives evaluation and outcomes where applicable, and recommendations for the functional areas of Fire, Police, Maintenance & Operations, Indoor Recreation, and Administration
- **Capital Investment Strategy** outlines near-term (6 years) and longer-term investment strategies and a feasible plan for implementation. It describes the benefits of implementing the CFP for reducing risk, addressing functional and condition issues, emergency preparedness and resilience, and improving services for underserved communities and geographies.

---

# 1 – Planning Context

## 1.1 – Capital Facilities Planning Requirements

Implementing the development of capital facilities requires a disciplined and comprehensive planning process, and this is accomplished with functional plans that meet requirements for capital facility planning set forth by the Growth Management Act and are consistent with policies in the Capital Facilities Element.

### State Law

The Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA) outlines the framework for capital facilities planning, including general government facilities. See [RCW 36.70A](#) and [RCW 36.70A.070\(3\)](#). Consistent with Capital Facilities Element policy CF-3, the City adopts this CFP by reference to ensure compliance with GMA requirements.

The GMA requires inclusion of:

GMA Requirement	CFP Response
An inventory of existing capital facilities owned by public entities, including green infrastructure, showing the locations and capacities of the capital facilities	See Section 2
A forecast for the future needs for such capital facilities.	See Section 3
The proposed locations and capacities of expanded or new capital facilities.	See Section 3
At least a six-year plan that will finance such capital facilities within projected funding capacities and clearly identifies sources of public money for such purposes	The City’s current Capital Investment Program (CIP) is the six-year financing plan that fulfills this requirement. Further information for outyears is provided in Sections 1 and 4.
A requirement to reassess the comprehensive plan land use element if probable funding falls short of meeting existing needs and to ensure that the land use element, capital facilities element, and financing plan are coordinated and consistent.	See the Capital Facilities Element policy CF-10

Further guidance is provided by [Washington Administrative Code 365-196-415](#).

The GMA also requires jurisdictions to have capital facilities in place and readily available when new development occurs, or population grows in a service area. This concept is known as “concurrency”, and it means that capital facilities needed to serve new development and/or a growing service area population must be in place at the time of initial need, and they must be of sufficient capacity serve the population. If the facilities are not in place, a financial commitment must be made to provide the facilities within six years




of the time of the initial need and maintain service levels at or above local minimum standards, known as levels-of-service.

## Redmond 2050 and the Capital Facilities Element

Redmond 2050 is the city’s comprehensive plan with strategies to shape development and advance community priorities as the population grows a projected 47% by 2050, from 80,000 to 118,000. Its guiding principles are equity and inclusion, resiliency, and sustainability.

The future land use map and zoning direct new development, population, and jobs to three mixed-use growth centers served by regional light rail transit: Downtown, Marymoor Village, and Overlake. Other key features of Redmond’s geography are two industrial areas northwest and southeast of Downtown, the regional Marymoor Park bordering the north end of Lake Sammamish, and multiple trail corridors. Redmond also has critical areas (environmental features) like streams, wetlands, and steep slopes where development is restricted.



Redmond 2050 future land use map (left) and neighborhoods map (right)

---

Redmond has been transitioning from being a Seattle suburb to a full-service city. As population and jobs grow and service demands increase, facilities that have served the community well for decades will be unable to meet growing needs without timely investments to address deficiencies and accommodate growth.

Redmond 2050 contains a Capital Facilities Element, which includes a facilities vision statement, general inventory, level-of-service standards, and goals and policies that guide financial decisions. It directs the development of the City's capital investment program in support of the community's vision for the future and affects both public agencies and private decisions related to individual developments.

This CFP is a functional plan for municipal facilities that contains more specific information and recommendations. See the General Government Facilities Plan Scope in the next section below. The CFP supports and implements the vision of the Redmond 2050 Comprehensive Plan, and is adopted by Council by reference into the Capital Facilities element in order to fulfill Growth Management Act and City requirements noted in Policy CF-2 for capital facilities planning. This plan also updates and extends the planning horizon of the 2025-30 Capital Facilities Plan – General Government Facilities to 2050.

Key Capital Facilities Element and related policies include (some are paraphrased for brevity):

- FW-CF-1 (one of several framework principles): Optimize strategic actions and investments over near-, mid-, and long-term portions of the Comprehensive Plan's 2050 planning horizon while recognizing the need to retain flexibility to leverage opportunities and respond to changing conditions.
- CF-6: Establish capital facility level-of-service standards that help determine long-term capital facility and funding requirements.
- CF-18: Identify shared capital needs and the lands that may be used to meet these needs with nearby cities, King County, neighboring counties, the State of Washington, the Puget Sound Regional Council, school districts, special purpose districts and other government agencies. Maintain a capital acquisition budget and schedule that reflects the jointly agreed upon priorities.
- CR-39 (Climate Resilience and Sustainability Element): Implement the City of Redmond Operations Zero Carbon Strategy to decarbonize and achieve carbon neutrality for city facilities, operations, and services.

## Policy CF-2 Checklist

Capital Facilities Element policy CF-2 establishes requirements for Redmond’s functional plans. The requirements are listed in the table below, alongside an explanation and section reference for how the CFP satisfies each.

CF-2 Requirement	CFP Response
<p>CF-2: Include in functional plans and supporting documents, at a minimum, the following components necessary to maintain an accurate account of long-term capital facility needs and associated costs to the City, and consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and applicable provisions of the Zoning Code:</p>	
<p>A description of the current capital facility infrastructure, including green infrastructure, and the scope and cost of its operation and maintenance;</p>	<p><u>Descriptions:</u> See the portfolio overview in <a href="#">Section 2.1</a></p> <p><u>Green infrastructure:</u> This is not applicable to the CFP because the GMA defines “green infrastructure” as non-building assets such as outdoor parks, tree canopy, and stormwater management practices. This type of green infrastructure is addressed by the City’s <a href="#">parks plans</a>, <a href="#">stormwater utility plans</a>, and the <a href="#">Environmental Sustainability Action Plan</a>. Some sustainability features of existing facilities are documented in <a href="#">Section 3</a>, and application of the City’s principles for decarbonization and sustainability to general government facilities are described in <a href="#">Section 1.2</a>.</p> <p><u>Scope of operations:</u> See the introductions to functional areas and descriptions of existing facilities in <a href="#">Section 3.1</a></p> <p><u>Cost of maintenance:</u> See the summary of maintenance liabilities in <a href="#">Section 2.2</a>, and the costs of maintenance in the project lists in Sections 3 and 4</p>
<p>A description of current capital facility deficiencies and appropriate strategies to remedy these deficiencies;</p>	<p><u>Current deficiencies:</u> See the summary of maintenance liabilities in <a href="#">Section 2.2</a></p> <p><u>Deficiency remedies:</u> Generally, most deficiencies and other liabilities will be addressed by funding 100% of the project costs identified by the 2023 Facility Conditions Assessment. See strategy details in the project lists of Sections 3 and 4.</p>
<p>An analysis of capital facilities needed through the year 2050, and preliminary cost estimates to meet those needs;</p>	<p><u>Capital facilities needed:</u> See qualitative descriptions of facility needs in <a href="#">Section 3</a>. See a list of functional plans that provide additional analysis in <a href="#">Section 1.2</a>.</p> <p><u>Preliminary cost estimates:</u> See the project lists in Sections 3 and 4</p>

CF-2 Requirement	CFP Response
An analysis specifying how capital facilities will be financed and maintained;	See Section 1.4 – Funding for Capital Investment
A description of the functional plan’s public outreach, participation and review process;	See <a href="#">Section 1.5</a>
Criteria to be used to prioritize projects and inform the Capital Investment Strategy;	See the CFP suggested supplemental criteria to the Capital Investment Strategy in <a href="#">Section 4.2</a>
An analysis of how proposed investments impact underserved communities and geographies;	See <a href="#">Section 1.2</a>
A description of how the plan addresses emergency preparedness and resilience to natural hazards, including climate change impacts;	See <a href="#">Section 1.2</a>
A description of how the functional plan and supporting documents fulfill Growth Management Act requirements; and	See <a href="#">Section 1.1</a>
An analysis indicating that the functional plan, including any subsequent revisions or modifications, is consistent with Comprehensive Plan policies, Zoning Code regulations, and applicable state and federal laws.	<p><u>Comprehensive Plan policies:</u> This table fulfills the key Comprehensive Plan policy applicable to general government facilities</p> <p><u>Zoning Code regulations:</u> See <a href="#">Section 1.6</a></p> <p><u>Applicable state and federal laws:</u> See <a href="#">Section 1.1</a></p>

---

## 1.2 – Facility Planning Principles

The section implements sub-policies of CF-2 related to:

- Decarbonization and sustainability
- Emergency preparedness and resilience to natural hazards
- Underserved communities and geographies

This section also addresses policy CF-6 with regards to the accessibility level-of-standard for general government facilities.

### Decarbonization and Sustainability

The following [key documents](#) guide the approach to decarbonization and sustainability of Redmond’s general government facilities:

- 2024 Portfolio Decarbonization Report
- 2021 City of Redmond Operations Zero Carbon Strategy
- 2020 Environmental Sustainability Action Plan
- 2025 Environmental Sustainability Action Plan (in development)

### Building Energy Use and Decarbonization

The City of Redmond has adopted aggressive sustainability goals for city operations through City Council’s Climate Emergency Declaration, including a goal of net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2030. Redmond also participates in the King County-Cities Climate Collaborative (K4C), which share a target to reduce energy use in all existing buildings 25% below 2012 levels by 2030. All new facilities must meet LEED Gold or a similar green building standard.

The City’s energy consumption is expected to increase from more than 10 million kWh annually to approximately 11.4 million kWh by 2030 due to the addition of new infrastructure, reinforcing the need for and importance of energy conservation. Fossil fuels used to heat and cool Redmond’s facilities account for nearly 20% of the City’s 2022 greenhouse gas emissions. Therefore, the strategic actions relevant to this CFP are focused on energy efficiency retrofits at existing municipal facilities, including transitioning space and water heating to all-electric and adding electric vehicle charging infrastructure for the City’s fleet.

The City of Redmond participates in PSE’s Green Direct program, which provides carbon-free electricity for approximately 85% of City operations’ electricity consumption. Because of the City’s participation in Green Direct, emissions from facilities account for about 36% of the City’s total 2022 GHG emissions, down from more than 71% in 2020, although this still illustrates the need for efficiency to reduce demand on the grid as more buildings are electrified.

In 2024 the City worked with Ecotope to complete a portfolio decarbonization analysis and report. The scope of the analysis included the significant facilities in the portfolio

---

(excluding Redmond Community Center at Marymoor Village, Maintenance & Operations Center, Police's North and South Garage buildings, and the Municipal Parking Garage). The analysis evaluated interrelated variables including energy use and on-site fossil fuel consumption, total greenhouse gas emissions, Washington state's 2019 Clean Buildings Performance Standard (CBPS) compliance requirements, and equipment age and condition of heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems. These variables were combined into weighted evaluation criteria to identify the degree to which each of these metrics might influence the prioritization of city facility upgrades and the deployment of decarbonization strategies in conjunction with any other maintenance work.

The results of the decarbonization analysis are integrated into a facilities dashboard created with the 2023 Facilities Condition Assessment by Meng Analysis.

Key findings:

- The Redmond Pool is the most energy intensive building in the City's portfolio on a per-square-foot basis. A majority of the building's energy demand is met by electricity.
- Fire stations have high energy use intensity for their size, and their energy demand is mostly met by gas, making them a key opportunity for retrofits
- City Hall has the greatest carbon emissions impact by a large margin, followed by the Redmond Pool, the Public Safety Building, Fire Station 16, and Fire Station 11
- City Hall and the Public Safety Building, being over 50,000 square feet of floor area, are the only facilities subject to CBPS compliance in 2028 and will be required to demonstrate improved energy performance compared to current operation. Other buildings only need to report performance.
- The Redmond Senior & Community Center, opened in 2024, was designed as an energy efficient and all-electric building. Evaluation of its performance is incomplete, but early indicators show it has a very low carbon impact and that it is possible for large buildings to significantly decarbonize.
- Eliminating on-site natural gas consumption, replacing gas-powered space heating and cooling equipment with electric heat pumps, and upgrading aging HVAC systems are common strategies recommended across the facilities portfolio
- Demand on the regional electric grid is increasing significantly as other jurisdictions and property owners seek to decarbonize. Redmond is partnering with Bellevue on a regional study of the issue. Case-by-case investigation of electrical capacity will be needed at each facility to inform retrofits' scope, especially as electric vehicle charging is added.

Relevant to the subsection on emergency preparedness, some Redmond facilities include on-site emergency generators to provide backup power (including all fire stations, the Public Safety Building, and City Hall). To maintain readiness, generators must be turned on weekly for about 30 minutes, which can represent a significant amount of combustion emissions beyond those generated by regular building operation. Generator use is not fully

---

included in the decarbonization analysis but is included in the City’s biannual greenhouse gas emissions inventory.

Maintenance projects can contribute to decarbonization goals by identifying and prioritizing maintenance and equipment replacement strategies that reduce building carbon impacts. In many cases, it is more efficient and cost-effective to bundle building upgrades together to reduce mobilization costs. In general, the work to decarbonize facilities are integrated into the recommended maintenance projects categorized as observed deficiencies, predicted renewals, and opportunity projects in the FCA. The project lists in Section 3 and 4 of this CFP group these projects under “routine maintenance” headings.

## Other Sustainability Measures

Besides energy use for building heating/cooling, sustainability documents from the City report that facility operations can be improved with the following key strategies related to water, solid waste, and transportation:

- Convert building lighting to efficient light emitting diode (LED) technology
- Consider opportunities to add on-site renewable energy generation to existing and new facilities, especially solar power
- Consider opportunities to use low-embodied carbon materials when designing and constructing new facilities
- Consider opportunities to capture rainwater, reuse water, reduce impervious surface area, and improve stormwater management
- Consider opportunities to protect and expand tree canopy coverage during major facility investments
- Reduce City operations-generated solid waste and divert more waste from the landfill with recycling and composting
- Locate new facilities on location-efficient sites with robust transportation options for staff commuting and the visiting public, including connections to quality transit and safe walking and biking routes
- Transition the City’s fleet to electric vehicles where models are available and are operationally feasible

In the current Capital Investment Program (CIP), \$1.3M is set aside for citywide sustainability improvements including automation of HVAC controls and converting to LED lighting, and is \$1.7M is provided for electric vehicle charging equipment at the Municipal Parking Garage, Fire Station 11, and Fire Station 12. Moving forward, the City intends to incorporate sustainability improvements in all major projects for general government facilities.

---

## Emergency Preparedness and Resilience to Natural Hazards

The following key documents guide the approach to emergency preparedness and resilience to natural hazards for Redmond’s general government facilities:

- [2023 Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan](#)
- [2022 Climate Vulnerability Assessment Report](#)
- [2020-2025 King County Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan: City of Redmond Annex](#)

### Summary of Hazards

The City of Redmond is dedicated to protecting the lives, property, and environment of its residents through preparedness, response, recovery, and mitigation activities. Redmond’s facilities must provide continuity of operations to support the community. In the context of the CFP, emergency preparedness and resilience to natural hazards involves potential risks from incidents like large earthquakes, flooding, major urban fires, wildfires, winter storms, power outages, utility disruptions (e.g. water supply), health hazards, terrorism, civil disturbances, and cyber attacks.

The King County Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan and the Redmond-specific annex to the plan provide detailed hazard and vulnerability identification, risk assessment, and mitigation planning. The Redmond Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan provides a framework for how the City government, its departments, and its employees will respond to emergency incidents.

Essential public services by functional area that need to be maintained during citywide emergencies include:

- Fire and Police – Responding to major life safety incidents, including emergency medical services, fire suppression, search and rescue, traffic control, and security operations
- Public Works – Responding to disruptions or damage in utility delivery and the transportation system
- Administration - Operation of the emergency operations center at City Hall, public communications, and coordination with partner agencies
- Park and Recreation – Operation of community centers as emergency shelters and community resilience hubs, and distribution of food and water to affected residents
- Parks Operations and Facilities – Response to storm damage at facilities, parks, and streets (e.g. tree damage)

Fire stations are particularly important. They are classified as essential facilities under the International Building Code and are designed to remain operational during catastrophic incidents. Further, new or remodeled fire stations present an opportunity for them perform a secondary role as community resilience hubs, with storage areas for volunteer



---

community emergency response (CERT) teams to make supplies accessible to neighborhoods during disasters.

## Facilities Planning and Maintenance

City facilities need to be adequately maintained so they can support incident response activities and continuation of essential services. The Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan establishes these key ongoing maintenance and management actions:

- Identify safety hazards. For those that can't be eliminated immediately, find ways to isolate or lessen risks pending permanent resolution.
- Verify structural and non-structural hazard analysis of city buildings to identify and mitigate hazardous conditions. This should be in coordination with facility management.
- Establish procedures to quickly determine threats to city facilities and to alert occupants
- Review each Facility Emergency Plan for city buildings and train personnel in regard to building emergency standard operating guidelines, including evacuation, shelter-in-place, and lockdown
- Maintain emergency backup power for all essential systems and facilities. Critical electronic data communication systems should have uninterruptible power supplies and surge protection.
- Periodically test building warning systems and procedures to ensure they remain functional
- Regularly verify that security cameras and monitors are working properly

The following are identified as key risks in the general government facilities portfolio:

- Multiple fire stations are beyond their expected service life and have compounding functional issues that hamper operational capacity and emergency readiness, especially at Fire Stations 11, 12, 13, and 14
- The Public Safety Building has significant maintenance liabilities and functional issues that hamper its ability to serve a growing workforce and maintain optimal emergency readiness
- Parts of Downtown are at elevated risk of earthquake and flooding impacts, which could impact the operations for multiple facilities including the Fire headquarters station, Police headquarters which also houses the 911 dispatch center, and the Administration headquarters which also houses the City's emergency operations center.
- Lack of public facilities in Overlake for City staff support, incident staging, emergency shelter, etc.
- Redundancy in power generation is a critical priority, but some facilities that provide critical functions do not have emergency generators or battery storage for backup power, or lack electrical equipment like transfer switches and portable generator plug-ins

---

## Capital Projects

The City applies current building codes to general government facilities projects and has been performing earthquake retrofits over time. For future capital projects the CFP addresses emergency preparedness considerations by:

- Recommending renovation or replacement of Fire Station 11 and replacement of Fire Station 12
- Recommending Redmond Fire and King County Fire District 34 coordinate to support facility reinvestment or replacement, particularly for Fire Stations 13 and 14
- Right-sizing new fire stations to improve distributing storage capacity for emergency supplies, along with including funding for a new Fire logistics facility for additional storage and streamlined supply chain management (e.g. shelter equipment, first aid supplies, and related resources)
- Recommending replacement of the Public Safety Building
- Recommending redevelopment of the Maintenance & Operations Center (MOC), which will include a modern department operations center for Public Works, Park Operations, and Facilities Management
- Recommending emergency generator upgrades at several fire stations and a new generator at Redmond Community Center at Marymoor Village (RCCMV), assuming City ownership). Battery storage could also be considered at facilities primarily powered by electricity, such as Redmond Senior & Community Center.
- Recommending new Fire, Police, and Indoor Recreation facilities in the Overlake neighborhood to provide better citywide coverage and public access
- Including “opportunity projects” for on-site renewable energy generation (i.e. solar panels) at multiple fire stations and RCCMV, assuming City ownership
- Recommending citywide municipal building renovations, maintenance, and repairs and “routine maintenance” at all facilities, including maintenance of essential electrical, plumbing, HVAC, telecommunications, security, and fire systems

---

## Underserved Communities and Geographies

The City has a duty in ensuring all Redmond residents and businesses have sufficient access to general government facilities and public services. As the city has grown over time, some communities and neighborhoods have had more investment than others. Both direct and indirect local policies and regulations have resulted in disparities. There is a concerted effort at the regional level and in Redmond to identify and address current and past inequities in zoning and land use policies particularly among communities of color, people with low-incomes, and historically underserved communities.

Considerations relevant to the CFP include:

- Fire has quantitative level of service standards for response time to maximize protection of life and property, which impacts the distribution of fire stations
- Police has a qualitative level of service standard for community expectations on response time. Officers are on patrol in their vehicles throughout the city, so distributed police facilities are less critical than for Fire.
- Parks and Recreation has level of service standards to ensure residents have reasonable access to indoor recreation options
- Public Works & Park Operations are less geography-sensitive and can rely on single/centralized locations because of their limited public interface and life-safety emergency response needs
- Customer-service oriented Administration and facilities community meeting spaces need to be easily accessible, while other administration functions are less geography-sensitive

The future land use map and zoning direct most new development, population, and jobs to three mixed-use growth centers served by regional light rail transit: Downtown, Marymoor Village, and Overlake. These growth centers are of particular interest because areas with higher and growing population density warrant greater public facilities investments to support quality of life, meet accessibility goals, ensure response time levels of service are met, and to make efficient use of resources.

## Communities at Risk of Displacement

The Redmond 2050 [Housing Element](#) defines displacement risk as: “Areas in the jurisdiction that may be at higher risk of displacement from market forces that occur with changes to zoning development regulations and public capital investments.” Displacement risk can be a useful indicator of populations facing racially disparate impacts, housing affordability challenges, or low incomes and who may be more sensitive to the impacts of government facility policies and investment decisions.

Data from the Puget Sound Regional Council finds that of the approximately 12 census tracts that make up most of Redmond, all but three were rated as “low” for displacement risk. All three of the census tracts that were not rated as “low” were rated as “moderate” displacement risk. Census tracts do not align perfectly with neighborhoods, but these

---

three tracts roughly include Downtown, Sammamish Valley, Willows / Rose Hill, and the southern portion of Overlake.

With this data and other analysis, City staff conclude a significant amount of residential displacement has already occurred and a large segment of the population cannot afford to live in Redmond. Downtown and Overlake are two of the three growth centers and have a concentration of existing and planned multifamily housing that is relatively less expensive than single-family housing, which may mean relatively moderate- and low-income households are located in these areas and drive the moderate displacement risk. City staff are also strategizing how to minimize business displacement as commercial properties are developed.

To avoid exacerbating existing trends, facilities investments (particularly land acquisition and new construction) should avoid or minimize the displacement of residents and businesses, especially low-moderate income residents and the businesses that serve them. To mitigate trends and promote multiple community goals, there is also a limited potential for new facilities to be part of mixed-use developments that include subsidized housing or commercial space, particularly in the three growth centers.

## Communities of Color

Redmond is a culturally diverse community with substantial populations from some BIPOC (Black, Indigenous, and People of Color) communities. In 2020, Redmond residents identified as:

- White: 49%
- Asian: 37%
- Hispanic or Latino (of any race): 8%
- Two or more races: 4%
- Black or African American: 2%
- Other race: 1%
- American Indian and Alaska Native: 0%
- Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander: 0%

The siting and design of general government facilities can have an impact on communities of color by changing their proximity and accessibility to public services. Areas of the city with the greatest concentrations of BIPOC residents (more than 50% of people identifying as a race other than White alone) are the southern portion of Overlake and Southeast Redmond.

## Overlake

A key underserved geography is the Overlake growth center. Various functional plans note Overlake lacks general government facilities for Police and Indoor Recreation. The neighborhood is also not ideally served by Redmond Fire, as identified by the Fire Functional Plan. During CFP development, Police identified a need for a police facility presence in Overlake as the area grows. These gaps are notable because Overlake is

---

already a dense, mixed-use area and is expected to continue growing from approximately 4,300 residents in 2019 to 23,000 residents by 2050, most of whom will live in multifamily housing.

The CFP plans to fill these gaps in the following ways:

- Fire Station 12 will be relocated more centrally to Overlake, providing faster response times for fire and medical calls to more people
- An Overlake police precinct will provide more support for law enforcement functions and customer service, and potentially reduce response times for major incidents
- An Overlake community center will fill a gap for indoor recreation identified by the Parks & Recreation Department
- A new Administrative office space is planned to open by 2030 as part of public-private partnership. This will bring more customer service functions and government presence to Overlake ahead of larger investments.

The City needs to acquire land or partner with non-City property owners for these new facilities. Consideration should be made for displacement risk and burdens when siting and designing new facilities to avoid exacerbating community impacts from market forces and physical development.

## **Downtown**

The Downtown growth center is well-served by the headquarters facilities for Fire, Police, and Administration. Potential displacement risk is low because general government facilities investments will likely be limited to locations where the City already owns land, including the Fire Station 11 site and the Redmond municipal campus.

The Redmond Senior & Community Center is a key asset for Downtown residents but somewhat distant from the core “center of gravity” for the Downtown population south of the campus. Maintenance and upgrades to the active transportation network will help ensure easy access to this facility.

## **Southeast Redmond / Marymoor Village**

Marymoor Village is a growth center within the larger Southeast Redmond neighborhood. Marymoor Village is transitioning from an industrial and commercial district to a mixed-use residential district. While close to Downtown and connected by a new light rail line, it is physically separated from Downtown’s government facilities by Highway 520 and major streets. The neighborhood is also not ideally served by Redmond Fire given its current and planned residential population density.

The key CFP recommendation for this area is the purchase and renovation of the Redmond Community Center at Marymoor Village. City ownership would allow full control over maintenance and capital investment. This will enable better predictability for future planning of facilities and recreation programs that serve residents in this area.

---

## Bear Creek / Avondale

The Bear Creek area, particularly along the Avondale Road corridor, is not a growth center but has a concentration of multifamily housing and a mobile home park serving some low-moderate income households. While no general government facilities are planned in this area, it is proximate to facilities in Downtown and Southeast Redmond. Maintenance and upgrades to the active transportation and transit networks, informed by a future corridor study, could improve access in and out of this area.

## Willows / Rose Hill

The Willows / Rose Hill neighborhood in northwest Redmond is a geography not ideally served by Redmond Fire, as identified by the Fire Functional Plan. However, mutual aid coverage is available from the City of Kirkland's Fire Station 26 to the west. Redmond Fire has identified the Willows Road corridor as a potential location for a fire station to maximize citywide coverage by Redmond Fire facilities.

Public safety is a key consideration because this area has a significant daytime employment population at industrial facilities and business parks. Other functional areas, such as Indoor Recreation, are less critical because large parts of the neighborhood are covered by forest and a golf course; the area has limited population density compared to the growth centers.

## Accessibility

The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) is a civil rights law that prohibits discrimination based on disability. As applied to facilities, it requires buildings that are accessible to the general public to meet minimum accessibility standards. It also requires applicable employers to provide reasonable accommodations to employees with disabilities. Practical implementation in public buildings includes items like handicap-accessible parking spaces, level ground-floor access and ramps, elevators in certain buildings, and interior furnishings and fixtures (such as light switches, door handles, and restrooms) that are easy to use by people with a range of physical disabilities.

Designing accessible buildings is a standard practice of contemporary architectural design, but buildings built before the ADA was enacted require retrofits to improve compliance. In 2019 the City prepared an [ADA Transition Plan](#) with upgrades strategically prioritized at facilities with higher public usage, such as City Hall, Redmond Pool, community centers, and the Public Safety Building.

# 1.2 – General Government Facilities Plan Scope

This CFP focuses on municipal facilities occupied by Redmond staff, maintained by Redmond’s facilities team, and/or open to the public. Within the CFP, facilities are grouped into five functional areas with color coding as follows:

Functional Area	Associated Departments / Agencies
<b>FIRE</b>	Redmond Fire Department and King County Fire District 34
<b>POLICE</b>	Redmond Police Department
<b>MAINTENANCE &amp; OPERATIONS</b>	Redmond Public Works Department (operational components) and Redmond Parks & Recreation Department (operational and maintenance components, including Facilities Management)
<b>INDOOR RECREATION</b>	Redmond Parks & Recreation Department (recreation component)
<b>ADMINISTRATION</b>	Multiple (all departments with a presence at City Hall)

For further details on some of the in-scope general government facilities in this plan, see the following:

- [Redmond Fire Department Functional Plan](#) (service background analysis, facility details, and equipment not covered by this CFP)
- [Redmond Fire Department Community Risk Assessment & Standards of Cover](#) (assesses risk and needs of the community including geographical considerations)
- [King County Fire District 34](#) (rural fire district operated in partnership with Redmond)
- [Redmond Police Department Functional Plan](#) (service background analysis, facility details, and equipment not covered by this CFP)
- [Redmond Parks, Arts, Recreation, Culture & Conservation \(PARCC\) Plan](#)

Out-of-scope capital facilities and public infrastructure are covered by the following Redmond plans or other agencies:

- Parks and recreation (parkland and other park facilities not covered by this CFP): [Redmond Parks, Arts, Recreation, Culture, and Conservation \(PARCC\) Plan](#)
- All City utilities: [Utilities Strategic Plan](#)
- Water utility: [Redmond Water System Plan](#)
- Wastewater/sanitary sewer utility: [Redmond General Wastewater Plan](#)
- Stormwater utility including green stormwater infrastructure:
  - [Stormwater Management Plan and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System \(NPDES\) Permit](#)
  - Stormwater and Surface Water System Plan (under development)
  - Stormwater Management Program Plan (updated annually)
  - [Watershed Management Plan](#)
- Solid waste utility
  - [Solid Waste and Recycling Program](#) (no functional plan; services in Redmond are provided by a private contractor)

- 
- King County Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan
  - King County Hazardous Waste Management Program Plan
  - Electricity and natural gas: [Puget Sound Energy](#)
  - Telecommunications: Various private providers
  - Transportation: [Redmond Transportation Master Plan](#)
  - Transit: [King County Metro](#) and [Sound Transit](#)
  - Schools: [Lake Washington School District](#) (six-year capital facility is updated annually)
  - Criminal justice: [King County](#)

DRAFT




# 1.3 – Summary of Costs

Estimated capital project costs for the City of Redmond through the 2050 planning period total to approximately \$885-943 million.

The table below shows capital costs by functional area and planned years of expenditure. All numbers are millions. Where a capital facility and land acquisition has a low-high cost range, only the higher cost is reflected in this summary. For detailed costs by functional year and timeframe, see Section 3 or Section 4.

TOTAL SPENDING						
Functional Area	2025-2026	2027-2032	2033-2040	2041-2050	2051+	TOTALS
CITYWIDE	\$5.4M	\$0.0M	\$0.0M	\$0.0M	--	\$5.4M
FIRE	\$7.8M	\$33.3M	\$50.4M	\$29.4M	\$70.0M	\$190.9M
POLICE	\$3.9M	\$19.8M	\$112.4M	\$50.0M	--	\$186.2M
MAINTENANCE & OPERATIONS	\$26.8M	\$201.3M	\$25.0M	\$46.9M	--	\$300.1M
INDOOR RECREATION	\$18.5M	\$28.8M	\$45.1M	\$106.4M	--	\$198.8M
ADMINISTRATION	\$2.0M	\$20.4M	\$18.8M	\$21.3M	--	\$62.4M
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$64.4M</b>	<b>\$303.5M</b>	<b>\$251.7M</b>	<b>\$254.1M</b>	<b>\$70.0M</b>	<b>\$943.8M</b>




# 1.4 – Funding for Capital Investment

Redmond’s Capital Investment Program (CIP) is a six-year financial plan that identifies capital investments and the strategies and resources for funding those investments. The CIP advances the City’s vision and supports the Capital Investment Strategy (CIS).

In the 2025-2026 budget biennium, general government facilities expenditures average approximately \$32 million per year. By comparison, spending will need to increase to an average of \$50.6 million annually in the six-year 2027-2032 CIP period to implement the CFP. This increase is driven by several major renovation and construction projects in the near-term, along with addressing a large maintenance backlog and opportunity projects for energy efficiency and other facility improvements. Average annual spending will decrease in later timeframes after new facilities are constructed and maintenance obligations change.

AVERAGE ANNUAL SPENDING				
Timeframe Length	2 years	6 years	8 years	10 years
Functional Area	2025-2026	2027-2032	2033-2040	2041-2050
CITYWIDE	\$2.7M	--	--	--
FIRE	\$3.9M	\$5.5M	\$6.3M	\$2.9M
POLICE	\$2.0M	\$3.3M	\$14.1M	\$5.0M
MAINTENANCE & OPERATIONS	\$13.4M	\$33.6M	\$3.1M	\$4.7M
INDOOR RECREATION	\$9.3M	\$4.8M	\$5.6M	\$10.6M
ADMINISTRATION	\$1.0M	\$3.4M	\$2.3M	\$2.1M
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$32.2M</b>	<b>\$50.6M</b>	<b>\$31.5M</b>	<b>\$25.4M</b>



Funding major civic facilities investments with cash is not feasible in most cases. Like other local governments in Washington State, the City of Redmond has multiple funding and financing options for general government facilities. City staff estimate the following sources and proportions for the planning period:

Revenue Source	2027-2032	2033-2040	2041-2050
General fund	27.5%	44.2%	40.6%
Real estate excise tax (REET)	24.4%	30.6%	34.2%
Impact fees	5.6%	14.9%	17.5%
Councilmanic bonds	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Grants	1.5%	5.5%	3.6%
Utilities	27.9%	0.0%	0.0%
Miscellaneous (investment interest, rebates, etc.)	2.0%	4.9%	4.1%

The proportions shown in the table above are not a commitment on how projects will be funded. These sources are assumed based on current and projected funding resources. Specific funding strategies will be developed over time during budget processes.

## 1.5 – Planning Process

This plan was prepared by MAKERS Architecture and Urban Design LLP (MAKERS) in partnership with the City of Redmond. ACC Cost Consultants (ACC) provided cost estimates to support the effort.

This plan is the culmination of the capital facilities planning conducted as part of the Redmond 2050 Comprehensive Plan update. It supports the updated policies found in the Capital Facilities element, and extends the planning horizon of the Capital Facilities Plan - General Government Facilities 2025-30 to the year 2050.

The Redmond 2050 planning process occurred over five years, and consisted of extensive community engagement, including community, Planning Commission, and Council feedback and input on the types and locations of facilities the City of Redmond needs and desires over the next 25 years.

Themes that emerged include:

- More inclusive, safer, and accessible facilities
- Upgrades to facilities for environmental sustainability and support efficiency and greenhouse gas reduction goals
- New facilities that support complete neighborhoods
- Desire for more community and cultural spaces, especially for children and seniors

Also of note, the City printed and distributed blank postcards to various locations throughout the community to encourage creative responses to the questions related to community design and needs. Of the 450 comments received, over 70 were related to facilities and infrastructure. More information on the City’s engagement process can be found online: <https://www.redmond.gov/1495/Engagement-Summaries>.

---

The CFP was developed in three phases:

- 1) Needs Assessment:** The project team established a baseline understanding of in-scope facilities by reviewing existing information, interviewing City staff, and visually assessing facility function. Facilities were then rated relative to condition, operational importance, and opportunities to meet other City goals such as energy performance and emergency preparedness. City leadership brainstormed potential solutions to the most challenging facilities issues at focused work sessions and a Visioning Workshop.
- 2) Alternatives Analysis:** Working with City staff, the team developed and evaluated alternative solutions to address priority issues where relevant. Staff provided feedback on how well each alternative met operational needs and project objectives and confirmed draft recommendations in each functional area.
- 3) Capital Recommendations and Plan:** Working with City leadership, the project team refined recommendations, assessed financial feasibility, developed a suggested implementation schedule in alignment with the CIP schedule, and drafted the CFP document. The team then refined the CFP to incorporate feedback from staff, Planning Commission, City Council, and the public. Additional opportunities for public feedback were provided at four Planning Commission meetings, a public hearing on September 24, 2025, and one City Council work session, with an additional one if needed.

# 1.6 – Zoning Analysis

This subsection fulfills a Capital Facilities Element policy requiring analysis of consistency with the Redmond Zoning Code. Other zoning codes are not included. The analysis is high-level and focuses on basic permitted land use standards. More detailed analysis of other standards should be done on a project-by-project basis, such as supplemental land use conditions, dimensional standards, open space, parking, and infrastructure requirements.


General Government Facility	Zone	Permitted Use Findings
<b>FIRE</b>		
Fire Station 11	Downtown Core	Public administration, which is broadly defined to include “government services” such as fire stations, is permitted outright.
Fire Station 11 Annex		
Fire Station 12	N/A	Non-Redmond zoning (City of Bellevue)
Fire Station 16	Manufacturing Park	Public administration, which is broadly defined to include “government services” such as fire stations, are limited or conditional use and limited to being located in the Manufacturing Park (MP) Overlay. These facilities are outside the overlay and therefore are nonconforming.
Apparatus Maintenance Facility		
Fire Station 17	Neighborhood Residential	Public administration, which is broadly defined to include “government services” such as fire stations, are a limited or conditional use, must avoid materially detrimental impacts to neighboring residential uses, and are required to provide a traffic mitigation plan.
Fire Station 13 (FD 34)	N/A	Non-Redmond zoning (King County)
Fire Station 14 (FD 34)	N/A	
Fire Station 18 (FD 34)	N/A	
Fire Station 11 Replacement	TBD	If renovated or replaced on same site or replaced municipal campus, see Fire Station 11 above. If replaced elsewhere, further zoning analysis will be needed.
Fire Station 12 Replacement	Overlake Business and Advanced Technology or Overlake Village	Public administration, which is broadly defined to include “government services” such as fire stations, is permitted outright in both zones.
<b>POLICE</b>		
Public Safety Building (PSB)	Downtown Core	Public administration, which is broadly defined to include “government services” such as police stations, is permitted outright.
North Garage Building		
South Garage Building		

<b>General Government Facility</b>	<b>Zone</b>	<b>Permitted Use Findings</b>
Overlake Police Precinct	Overlake Business and Advanced Technology or Overlake Village	Public administration, which is broadly defined to include “government services” such as police stations, is permitted outright in both zones.
<b>MAINTENANCE &amp; OPERATIONS</b>		
Maintenance & Operations Center (MOC)	Manufacturing Park	Public administration, which is broadly defined to include “government services” such as operations yards, are limited or conditional use and may only be in the Manufacturing Park (MP) Overlay. The MOC is outside the overlay and therefore is nonconforming. The fuel facility may not be permitted in the critical aquifer recharge area (see RZC 21.04.5000 and 21.64.050).
<b>INDOOR RECREATION</b>		
Redmond Pool	Neighborhood Residential	Public pools are not explicitly referenced, and may be a nonconforming use. A CUP is required for commercial swimming pools. In general, recreation and assembly uses are a limited use and have limits on facility capacity, must avoid materially detrimental impacts to neighboring residential uses, and are required to provide a traffic mitigation plan.
Redmond Senior & Community Center (RSCC)	Downtown Core	Recreation and assembly uses are permitted outright.
Redmond Community Center at Marymoor Village (RCCMV)	Marymoor Edge	Recreation and assembly uses are permitted outright.
Old Fire House Teen Center	Downtown Core	Recreation and assembly uses are permitted outright.
Overlake Community Center	Overlake Business and Advanced Technology or Overlake Village	Recreation and assembly uses are permitted outright in both zones.
<b>ADMINISTRATION</b>		
Redmond City Hall	Downtown Core	Public administration is permitted outright.
Municipal Parking Garage	Downtown Core	Accessory to City Hall and other municipal campus uses. Automobile parking facilities are also permitted outright.

# 2 – Portfolio Overview

## 2.1 – Introduction

As of 2025, the General Government Facilities Plan covers 12 sites and 32 buildings with an approximate building floor area of 586,000 square feet.



Citywide general government facilities map

<b>General Government Facility</b>	<b>Year Built</b>	<b>Building Floor Area (gross square feet)</b>	<b>Full Time Employees</b>
<b>FIRE</b>			
Fire Station 11	1981	21,271	20
Fire Station 11 Annex	1985	1,916	5
Fire Station 12	1980	6,637	19
Fire Station 16	1996	9,852	15
Apparatus Maintenance Facility	1996	5,625	3
Fire Station 17	2012	19,397	7
Fire Station 13 (FD34)	1973	6,548	12
Fire Station 14 (FD34)	1991	9,530	9
Fire Station 18 (FD34)	2002	7,714	10
<b>POLICE</b>			
Public Safety Building (PSB)	1990	94,975	134 (not including cadets and volunteers)
North Garage Building	2008	1,250	0
South Garage Building	2008	1,000	0
<b>MAINTENANCE &amp; OPERATIONS</b>			
Maintenance & Operations Center (MOC) – 14 buildings and structures	1970-2005	63,627 (total enclosed area)	151
<b>INDOOR RECREATION</b>			
Redmond Pool	1970	12,554	0 (contracted out)
Redmond Senior & Community Center (RSCC)	2024	56,481	7
Redmond Community Center at Marymoor Village (RCCMV)	2005	20,491	8
Old Fire House Teen Center	1952	2,500	0 (currently closed)
<b>ADMINISTRATION</b>			
Redmond City Hall	2005	113,068	284
Municipal Parking Garage	2005	125,959	0

*Citywide general government facilities inventory*



## 2.2 – Facility Condition Assessment

MENG Analysis completed a facility condition assessment (FCA) and decarbonization plan for City-owned buildings in 2013 and 2023. Most relevant to the CFP, the FCA includes a Facility Condition Index and lists each facility’s maintenance liabilities.

### Facility Condition Index (FCI)

The FCI measures the relative condition of facilities within the portfolio. It is calculated by dividing the total maintenance backlog by current replacement value (CRV). An FCI less than 0.10 is good or excellent, and an FCI greater than 0.21 is poor or critical.

The 2023 FCA finds that most Redmond facilities are in reasonably good condition, with notable exceptions at Fire Stations 11, 12, and 13 and significant issues at the Old Fire House Teen Center. Conditions have greatly improved at the Redmond Pool due to recent investment.

Note that the Maintenance & Operations Center is absent from the 2023 FCA due to its status as a high priority replacement project. The Redmond Senior & Community Center is absent as it opened after the FCA was conducted.

General Government Facility	Previous FCI (2013)	Current FCI (2023)	Interpretation (2023)	Condition Change
<b>FIRE</b>				
Fire Station 11	0.21	0.19	Fair	Improved
FS 11 Annex	0.18	0.21	Poor	Worsened
Fire Station 12	0.18	0.18	Fair	Constant
Fire Station 16	0.14	0.12	Fair	Improved
Apparatus Maintenance Facility	0.11	0.11	Fair	Constant
Fire Station 17	0.02	0.13	Fair	Worsened
Fire Station 13 (FD34)	0.20	0.18	Fair	Improved
Fire Station 14 (FD34)	0.12	0.12	Fair	Constant
Fire Station 18 (FD34)	0.06	0.11	Fair	Worsened
<b>POLICE</b>				
Public Safety Building	0.14	0.16	Fair	Worsened
North Garage Building	0.02	0.04	Excellent	Worsened
South Garage Building	0.02	0.04	Excellent	Worsened
<b>INDOOR RECREATION</b>				
Redmond Pool	0.23	0.11	Fair	Improved
Redmond Community Center at Marymoor Village (RCCMV)	N/A	0.10	Good	N/A
Old Fire House Teen Center	0.22	0.23	Poor	Worsened
<b>ADMINISTRATION</b>				
Redmond City Hall	0.05	0.09	Good	Worsened
Municipal Parking Garage	0.10	0.12	Fair	Worsened

---

## Operations and Maintenance

Adequately funded and performed maintenance is necessary to maintain operations at any facility. Proactive maintenance handles small issues before they spiral into major problems and also maintains comfort for building staff and visitors. Proper maintenance can extend the service life of facilities and prolong the intervals between major reinvestment and replacement, saving public dollars.

The costs of routine maintenance are provided in this CFP, drawing from the observed deficiencies and planned renewals documented in the 2023 Facility Conditions Assessment and major maintenance already planned in the Capital Investment Program.

### Observed Deficiencies and Predicted Renewals

The FCA breaks down maintenance liabilities by facility and by system type. Liabilities are identified either as observed deficiencies or predicted renewals:

- A “deficiency” requires remediation within five years and has a direct cost of at least \$5,000. These are identified through survey site visits and facility staff. The FCA calculates deficiencies for the years 2023-2028.
- A “renewal” is a building system that should be planned for replacement at the end of its estimated lifespan. These are predicted through computer modeling based on historical models of similar buildings. The FCA calculates planned renewals for the years 2029-2042.


For estimated maintenance liabilities after 2042 and for new buildings not covered by the FCA, see methodology in Section 4.3.

The Public Safety Building (PSB), City Hall, and Fire Station 11 make up the bulk of Redmond’s maintenance liabilities. The PSB is responsible for \$7.3 million in observed deficiencies and \$30.1 million in predicted renewals across all building systems; City Hall is responsible for \$1.4 million in deficiencies and \$8.1 million in renewals; and Fire Station 11 is responsible for \$2.9 million in deficiencies and \$9.7 million in renewals. Among Redmond’s highest priority functional areas to address, Fire facilities make up about 40 percent of Redmond’s total deficiencies.

Heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) is the highest cost deficiency category across the Redmond portfolio, followed by exterior enclosures. The Public Safety Building, Fire Station 11, and Old Fire House Teen Center have the highest deficiency costs; Fire Station 16, the Apparatus Maintenance Facility, and Fire Station 18 have some of the lowest of these costs. 2025 is the year with the largest deficiency cost total across all facilities, at \$7.8 million. The lowest deficiency cost total is projected to be 2028, at \$2.5 million.

Electrical infrastructure is the most expensive renewal category, closely followed by exterior enclosures and interior finishes. The Public Safety Building, City Hall, and Fire Station 11 have the highest projected renewal costs through 2042; Fire Station 16, the Apparatus Maintenance Facility, and Fire Station 18 have some of the lowest of these


costs. 2029 and 2031 are projected to be the years with the highest renewal cost total across all facilities, at \$17.9 million respectively. Only \$0.1 million will be spent on renewals in 2039.



Maintenance liabilities by building and system

## Opportunity Projects

The FCA also identifies “opportunity projects”. These are optional projects identified by the surveyor to improve user experience, resiliency, safety, security, or energy efficiency. HVAC, electrical, and plumbing systems represent the most significant opportunities across Redmond facilities. The ‘Other’ category in the graphic below includes security features, fuel infrastructure, and other unique items across the portfolio, including major municipal campus improvements (see related notes in Section 3.7).



*Opportunity projects by system*

## Remedies

Most deficiencies, renewals, and opportunities will be addressed by funding routine maintenance and/or major renovations. The project lists in Section 3 and 4 include this work under “routine maintenance” headings and these generally include 100% of the costs identified by the FCA, with some exceptions. Opportunity costs for applicable facilities are generally split between the 2027-2032 and 2033-2040 timeframes.

The project lists note where some deficiencies, renewals, and opportunities costs are reduced or foregone when a facility is planned to be replaced.

---

## 2.3 – Qualitative Facility Rankings

Select facilities were qualitatively ranked by their ability to meet operational requirements. Buildings not ranked include the Fire Station 11 Annex and the Apparatus Maintenance Facility, the scores of which were tied with Fire Station 11 and Fire Station 16, respectively. Periphery buildings like the North and South Garage Buildings at the Public Safety Building and the Municipal Parking Garage were also not assessed. The Maintenance & Operations Center was excluded due to its separate planning and reconstruction process currently underway.

The selected facilities were ranked according to the following criteria:

- **Condition** considers physical condition, maintenance frequency, and complexity, as noted by the FCA and reported by Redmond facilities staff
- **Function and Quality** considers workspace quality and gender neutrality, health and security, and workspace functionality
- **Criticality** considers the relative importance of a facility in providing services, the volume of services provided, the consequence of service disruptions, and the criticality of the facility in responding to emergencies and/or providing essential services during emergency conditions or recovery
- **Opportunity** considers the ability of the building and property to adapt to future needs and the opportunity to improve performance related to building energy use, LEED goals, equity, and other citywide initiatives and goals

Rankings are summarized in the following table: darker colors represent poor performance and indicate higher priorities to address in the CFP. As shown, Fire Stations 11 and 12 are in the worst condition and have poor workspace function and quality. These are critical facilities with investments that offer opportunities to support citywide initiatives and goals and the highest priorities for investments. Blank cells indicate a building was not assessed in that category.

General Government Facility	Condition	Function and Quality	Criticality	Opportunity
<b>FIRE</b>				
Fire Station 11				
Fire Station 12				
Fire Station 16				
Fire Station 17				
Fire Station 13 (FD34)				
Fire Station 14 (FD34)				
Fire Station 18 (FD34)				
<b>POLICE</b>				
Public Safety Building				
<b>INDOOR RECREATION</b>				
Redmond Pool				
Redmond Community Center at Marymoor Village (RCCMV)				
Old Fire House Teen Center		N/A		
Redmond Senior & Community Center (RSCC)	N/A			
<b>ADMINISTRATION</b>				
Redmond City Hall				

Facility assessment findings summarized



Note: Blank cells indicate a building was not assessed in that category. At the time the CFP was developed the Old Fire House Teen Center was vacant and RSCC was newly completed.

## 2.4 – Service Life


Facilities planning considers “service life”, or the length of time for which a component or facility typically remains usable for its intended purpose. Facility service life varies depending on maintenance upkeep, functional requirements, and construction quality. A well-built facility meeting user needs can be renovated to extend its service life, while a poorly constructed, not purpose-built facility may require premature investments and/or early replacement.

Typical service life assumptions are provided by the federal government:

Facility Type	Service Life
Pools	30 years
Fire stations	45 years
All other facilities (police stations, community centers, operations yards, etc.)	55 years

*Unified Facilities Criteria “3-701-01 DoD Facilities Pricing Guide”*

As illustrated below, ten of Redmond’s facilities are at or approaching the end of typical service life. Fire Stations 11 and its Annex, 12, and 13 are at or beyond the 45-year mark and due for reinvestment or replacement and Fire Station 16 and the Apparatus Maintenance Facility will be approaching end of service life in 15 years. Even with reinvestment, the Redmond Pool building shell is well beyond the typical 30-year service life, and the Public Safety Building will need investment or replacement by 2050. Other facilities at end of life are being addressed in parallel efforts: the MOC is planned for replacement and the City is studying the best approach to address the Old Fire House Teen Center. Fire Stations 13 and 14 are the responsibilities of Fire District 34.



*Dashed lines indicate service life for different facility types*

# 3 – Existing Conditions and Recommendations

## 3.1 – Introduction

This chapter is organized by functional area and covers:

- **Key Findings:** Summarizes facility location and function and highlights key issues and considerations
- **Summary Recommendations and Project List:** Provides recommendations and target implementation dates departmentwide within four timeframes aligned with Redmond budget cycles: projects underway or in the current Capital Investment Plan (CIP) through 2032; 2033-2040; 2041-2050; and beyond 2050.


Municipal campus considerations are included in its own section due to intersections with Administration, Police, Indoor Recreation, and potentially Fire facilities.

## 3.2 – Fire

The Fire Department (Fire) operates nine buildings at seven sites within a 45-square-mile service area. This includes seven fire stations, an apparatus maintenance facility at the Fire Station 16 site, and an annex building at the Fire Station 11 site for the Mobile Integrated Health and Community Care outreach programs.

### Fire Fast Facts

- 7 facilities
- 9 buildings
- 88,490 gross square feet
- 99 firefighters and support staff





---

The Fire service area includes [King County Fire Protection District 34](#) (FD 34), a 28-square-mile area east of city limits in unincorporated King County with approximately 24,700 residents. FD 34 is a special district governed by an elected board of commissioners. The district contains Stations 13, 14, and 18. In a partnership dating back to 1969, the City of Redmond owns these three stations and staffs them with City employees, and these stations are operationally integrated with the City's Fire department.

Through an interlocal agreement between Redmond and FD 34, capital responsibilities and cost-sharing for these stations is structured as follows:

- Major capital improvements and facility renovations are led and funded by FD 34
- The City of Redmond is responsible for routine maintenance, managed through either Facility Management or Fire Department staff
- Apparatus replacement for FD 34 stations is funded by the district through an apportioned cost model and is aligned with Redmond Fire's joint capital planning process

As FD 34 is responsible for major capital improvements and facility renovations Stations 13, 14, and 18, they were not included in this CFP's recommendations or fire impact fee planning. Functional needs and issues are noted here, but capital improvements and renovations will require separate planning and funding through FD 34's governance.

Capital Facility Element policy CF-6 establishes this level of service for Fire Department services: *Travel time of six minutes or less for 90 percent of emergency fire and medical calls in the city.*

Notable systemwide planning considerations for Fire include:

- For new fire stations, Redmond assumes a standard configuration of four apparatus bays and capacity for up to 10 operational personnel, resulting in an estimated 20,000 square foot footprint
- Older stations do not meet best practices for station design, including an emphasis on accommodating decontamination for firefighter equipment, and preventing contamination in living areas, and healthy sleeping environments
- Fire apparatus (trucks, engines, and ambulances) are unique equipment that need to be supported by adequately designed facilities
- Redmond has a higher-than-average share of female firefighters, which highlights the lack of gender-appropriate features at some older stations, such as undersized restrooms
- Stations ideally have extra capacity for staff during temporary situations, such as an extended emergency or a facility repair
- Training and exercise happen regularly at all stations, indoor and outdoor, though some stations better support certain training activities
- Lack of adequate security systems for parking areas and buildings is a common issue

---

## Key Findings

### Fire Station 11

8450 161st Avenue Northeast, Redmond, WA 98052



Fire Station 11 serves the Downtown area and the Willows, Education Hill, and Sammamish Valley neighborhoods. It functions as the Fire headquarters (including for Fire District 34) and it is the primary logistics coordination point. It has a four-lane apparatus bay and houses seven firefighters per shift, along with 13 administrative staff.

The Fire Station 11 Annex building also serves as the operational base for the department's Mobile Integrated Health and Community Care outreach programs. It represents a growing capital category for alternative response models that reduce 911 call volume and improve outcomes through upstream care. A decision on the future location of these programs will be made after reinvestment is planned for Fire Station 11.

Fire Station 11 needs a renovation or replacement to meet modern standards due to the building's age and condition, misalignment with modern best practices for station design, and supporting new apparatus needs.

Functional issues include:

- Insufficient dorm and storage space for added staffing or specialty teams
- Poor internal zoning for modern turnout flow and decontamination
- Poor design for sleep hygiene, including lack of split tones for different units
- Does not meet current earthquake design standards
- Administrative functions and the visitor lobby are constrained with no room for growth
- The station lacks adequate meeting and training space for firefighters and administrators

- 
- A tractor-drawn aerial (TDA), or large ladder truck, is necessary to serve taller buildings in Downtown but a TDA cannot fit in the existing apparatus bay
  - Poor drainage in the apparatus bay
  - Lack of gender-appropriate features

The Fire Functional Plan also notes the station's current location in Downtown is not ideal for meeting level-of-service requirements and maximizing citywide coverage. Alternatives for the future of this facility are explored in the [Fire Station 11 Alternatives Evaluation](#).

DRAFT

## Fire Station 12

4211 148th Ave NE, Bellevue, WA 98007



Fire Station 12 serves the Overlake, Viewpoint, Grass Lawn, Rose Hill, and Idlywood neighborhoods. Its specialty is physical fitness equipment. It has a three-lane apparatus bay and houses five firefighters per shift. It recently began hosting the first electric fire engine in Washington state, and additional electric vehicle infrastructure is planned.

Fire Station 12 needs replacement to meet modern standards due to the building's age and condition and misalignment with modern best practices for station design. It also needs relocation into the Redmond city limits at a location to better meet the level of service standards.

Functional issues include:

- Insufficient dorm and storage space for added staffing or specialty teams
- Poor internal zoning for modern turnout flow and decontamination
- Poor design for sleep hygiene, including lack of split tones for different units
- Does not meet current earthquake design standards
- Lack of gender-appropriate features
- The site is undersized for growth and training opportunities
- Staff parking is limited
- The site is located in Bellevue and not well-located for serving the Overlake growth center

---

## Fire Station 16

6502 185th Ave NE, Redmond, WA 98052



Fire Station 16 serves the southeast area of Redmond, including light industrial and residential districts. Its specialty is technical rescue. It has a three-lane apparatus and houses three firefighters per shift. Fire Station 16 is part of a multi-building site that also hosts the Apparatus Maintenance Facility.

The station has been upgraded since its original construction to meet earthquake design standards.

Functional issues include:

- Limited ground-floor storage in the apparatus bay for heavy equipment and supplies
- Lack of gender-appropriate features
- Common areas have a spartan commercial feel as opposed to the residential nature of fire stations

---

## Fire Station 17

16917 NE 116th St, Redmond, WA 98052



Fire Station 17 serves the north part of Redmond, including Education Hill. Its specialty is emergency medical services supply, and it has the City’s backup emergency operations center. It has a three-lane apparatus bay and houses four firefighters per shift, in addition to the Fire Department’s medical services officer.

This is Redmond’s newest fire station and it was designed to meet earthquake design standards in place at the time (2012).

Functional issues include:

- Several rooms are unfinished from the original construction in 2012, hampering the capacity for additional firefighters, medical administrative staff, and storage
- The exterior cladding is failing and needs to be replaced (currently planned for 2025)
- The building has poor energy performance
- Staff parking is limited

In addition, the City of Redmond owns a small parcel adjacent to the station. This parcel is vacant and used for training. Adjacent wetlands and buffer restrictions reduce the feasibility of developing this parcel with improved training facilities or other functions.

---

## Fire Station 13 (FD 34)

8791 208th Ave NE, Redmond, WA 98053

Fire Station 13 serves the Avondale corridor parts of Education Hill. Its specialty is hazardous materials equipment. It houses three firefighters per shift.

Functional issues include:

- Apparatus bay is too small to allow for expansion of crews and operations
- Inadequate exhaust system for the apparatus bay
- Poorly functioning septic system, which has previously required a temporary building closure for repairs
- Poorly functioning building systems, including electrical and HVAC, and a failing roof
- Does not meet current earthquake design standards
- Lack of gender-appropriate features

## Fire Station 14 (FD 34)

5021 264th Ave NE, Redmond, WA 98053

Fire Station 14 serves the eastern rural areas of the district. Its specialty is personal protective equipment. It houses three firefighters per shift.

The station has been upgraded since its original construction to meet earthquake design standards.

Functional issues include:

- Apparatus bay is too small to allow for expansion of crews and operations
- Inadequate exhaust system for the apparatus bay
- Poorly functioning building systems, including electrical, HVAC, and plumbing
- Lack of gender-appropriate features
- Exterior paving is in poor condition

---

## Fire Station 18 (FD 34)

22710 NE Alder Crest Dr, Redmond, WA 98053



Fire Station 18 serves the Redmond Ridge and Trilogy neighborhoods. Its specialty is small tools and apparatus supplies, and responding to calls on neighborhood trails. It has a three-lane apparatus bay and houses three firefighters per shift.

The station has been upgraded since its original construction to meet earthquake design standards.

Functional issues include:

- Lack of tool and supply storage, and an undersized workshop area
- Lack of interior training opportunities
- Poor design for sleep hygiene (though not to the extent of other stations)



---

## Apparatus Maintenance Facility

6502 185th Ave NE, Redmond, WA 98052



The Apparatus Maintenance Facility maintains all Fire Department apparatus and other vehicles. After the redevelopment of the Maintenance & Operations Center (MOC) is completed, maintenance of smaller Fire vehicles, such as staff cars, will move to the MOC. The Fire Fleet Shop will remain focused on maintaining larger firefighting apparatus (trucks, engines, and ambulances).


Functional issues include:

- The building has adequate capacity, but one of the three maintenance bays is not pull-through
- There are no decontamination facilities for staff
- Some mechanical equipment is obsolete, such as vehicle lifts and pump-testing tools


# Fire Station 11 Alternatives Evaluation

Several reinvestment alternatives were studied for Fire Station 11, with key considerations noted in the list below:

- **Alternative 1:** A major renovation of the existing building. Most, but not all, of the building’s physical and functional issues would be addressed. Expansion of the apparatus bay was assumed for this CFP (expansion of dorm rooms and office space will also be under consideration by the Fire department in an upcoming feasibility study).. This would require temporary facilities for at least two years.
- **Alternative 2:** Rebuild the station on the current site. A new building would meet all modern standards and could likely be rightsized for current and future needs. This would require temporary facilities for at least two years.
- **Alternative 3:** Rebuild the station at the Redmond municipal campus. A new building would meet all modern standards and could be rightsized for current and future needs. This would not require temporary facilities and could be built while the existing building remains in operation.



**Alt 1: Major Renovation**



**Alt 2: Rebuild in Place**



**Alt 3: Build New at Municipal Campus**

*Diagrammatic illustrations of the three potential alternatives for Fire Station 11*

---

## Summary Recommendations and Project List

### Fire Station 11

#### Apparatus Bay Expansion

Expansion of the Fire Station 11 apparatus bay is an unavoidable cost necessary to accommodate a new TDA. The TDA is expected to be delivered from the manufacturer by 2028, before the next major investment for the station can be designed and implemented.

#### Alternatives Recommendation: Conduct a Renovation and Replacement Study

The Fire Functional Plan identifies “Station 11 Phase 2 Study” to prepare for long-term facility decisions. This study will evaluate options for a major renovation or replacement of the station. The current scope of the study is:

- Expansion needs for administrative functions
- Long-term seismic and energy performance upgrades
- Opportunities for co-location or modular design with other city functions
- Site feasibility for expansion/remodel of Station 11 at its current location

Ideally the study would also include:

- Evaluation of options to reconstruct the facility on the existing site and at alternative locations, such as the municipal campus. A replacement could reduce the expense and risks of reinvesting in an older building that is undersized and may be challenging to upgrade to modern standards.
- Consideration of costs and challenges of operating a temporary facility during renovation or redevelopment
- Estimate of the potential for capital revenue from a land sale or ground lease

#### Future Relocation

The Fire Functional Plan identifies a need to relocate this facility after 2050, in conjunction with a new Fire Station 19, to maximize level of service and citywide coverage. If replacement occurs in the near-term, relocation will also be considered in the planning process.



*Example of a tractor-drawn aerial ladder truck*

## Fire Station 12

The replacement and relocation of Fire Station 12 is a top priority and recommended for the 2033-2040 timeframe. The station is currently located outside Redmond city limits in Bellevue, and it is not well-positioned to meet level of service and response times for the Overlake growth center and the Idylwood residential neighborhood.



Fire Station 12

The relocation of the station will require the acquisition of new land in Overlake, which is a challenging proposition because of the limited land available for sale on the private market and the subsequent price of land and real estate in the area. The City has preliminarily identified a potential site at Redmond Technology Station, known as the “remainder parcel”, that is at the corner of 156th Avenue NE and NE 36th Street. The 1.6 acre parcel is currently owned by Sound Transit and Microsoft has the first right of refusal since the site was originally owned by Microsoft before it was acquired for transit purposes. The City has considered concepts for a vertical mixed-use facility at this location, potentially including police and community functions.



*Redmond Technology Station. The “remainder parcel” is the vacant area on the southeast corner.*

Should the “remainder parcel” prove unavailable, there are other potential sites in the area owned by Microsoft and other private landowners. The estimated property acquisition cost reflects a minimum site size of 1.25 acres for this fire station. A larger site would be needed for co-location with an Overlake police precinct or other public facilities. Another possibility is co-location with a mixed-use residential or commercial building with the fire station on the ground level; while a common arrangement in global cities, this would be a new format for Redmond and it depends on finding a willing development partner.

---

## Fire Station 16

This station is past the midpoint of a typical 45-year service life, and it is due for lifecycle renovations. No other major projects are planned for this facility.

## Fire Station 17

The planned interior buildout should proceed to maximize the staffing capacity of this facility.

This station will reach the midpoint of a typical 45-year service life in 2035 and it will be due for lifecycle renovations. No other major projects are planned for this facility.



*Unfinished space at Fire Station 17*

## Fire Station 19

The Fire Functional Plan identifies this new station to be built after the planning period (2051+) to address the widening level of service deficiencies for the Downtown area. The need for a new station northeast of Downtown was originally modeled based on a relocated Fire Station 11 moving west of Downtown to the Willows Road area. If Fire Station 11 is retained in Downtown, the need for this new station and/or its location will need to be reevaluated.

## Fire Stations 13, 14, and 18 (FD 34)

Major capital improvements and facility renovations for these three stations are led and funded by FD 34. Coordination between Redmond Fire and FD 34 is needed to support facility reinvestment or replacement, particularly for Fire Stations 13 and 14 in the near- or mid-term, to meet modern best practices for station design and improve operational capabilities.

## Apparatus Maintenance Facility

This facility will be due for lifecycle renovations in the planning period. No other major projects are planned.

## Fire Logistics Facility

The Fire Functional Plan identifies the need for a centralized logistics facility to reduce burdens on operational space and firefighter staff time at individual stations. Fire operations require constant resupply and regular upgrades for a variety of equipment. A central facility can streamline receiving and distribution for the Fire department and citywide emergency preparedness needs. Centralized space is also desired for storage of some Fire reserve vehicles, which currently occupy bay space at several stations or are parked outdoors and exposed to weather (some reserve vehicles would remain at high-call stations).

In the near-term, leasing an existing warehouse space with capacity for vehicle storage is the most likely approach and funding is in the project list. Redmond has several industrial

---

areas, including Southeast Redmond and the Willows Road corridor, that may have suitable warehouse space available.

City ownership of a logistics facility is eventually desired. The Fire Functional Plan includes \$5M for investment in a City-owned facility; this could be a new location or a shared facility at the MOC. The Bellevue Fire Department is also known to have a similar logistics need and could be a potential partner for a jointly operated facility.

## Fire Training Facility

The Fire Functional Plan identifies a long-term need for a City-owned training facility to support firefighter recruit academies, specialty instruction, and coordinated training exercises. The department currently lacks a dedicated, department-controlled facility suitable for in-service instruction, large-scale drills, or multi-agency exercises. Most hands-on training occurs at fire stations or temporary spaces, which limits flexibility and accessibility. While regional partnerships currently provide some access, these arrangements present challenges in scheduling, scale, and long-term sustainability. A local training space would improve readiness, accelerate onboarding, reduce overtime due to unfilled vacancies, and support specialized needs including rail, high-rise, and wildland response.



*Vehicle extrication training at the empty lot next to Fire Station 17*

## Fire Project List

The Fire Functional Plan lists firefighting equipment and mobile apparatus as capital costs that are not included in this list. For notes on project lists, see Section 4.3.

TIMEFRAME	PROJECT	ROM COST	NOTES
2025-2026	EV charging stations at fire stations	\$0.9M	FS 11 and FS 12. Cost from Fire Functional Plan.
2025-2026	Personal protective equipment storage upgrades	\$0.3M	Cost from Current CIP 2025-2030
2025-2026	FS 11 repairs	\$5.0M	Cost from Fire Functional Plan. Total cost of 2023-2028 OD and partial cost of 2029-2032 PR.
2025-2026	FS 17 interior buildout and admin relief	\$0.4M	Cost from Fire Functional Plan
2025-2026	FS 17 siding replacement	\$1.2M	Cost from Current CIP 2025-2030
2027-2032	Diesel exhaust upgrades	\$0.5M	Multiple stations. Cost from Fire Functional Plan.
2027-2032	Emergency generator upgrades	\$0.5M	Multiple stations. Cost from Fire Functional Plan.
2027-2032	FS 11 partial remodel (apparatus bay expansion)	\$1.6M	Cost from Fire Functional Plan
2027-2032	FS 11 renovation and replacement study	\$0.4M	Cost from Fire Functional Plan
2027-2032	FS 11 renovation or replacement	\$15.0M	Cost from Fire Functional Plan for renovation. Project type decision is pending study results.
2027-2032	Logistics - Tenant improvements to leased warehouse	\$0.6M	Cost from Fire Functional Plan
2027-2032	Logistics - City-owned investment	\$5.0M	New facility or shared storage at MOC. Cost from Fire Functional Plan.
2027-2032	Routine maintenance		Costs from 2023 FCA. Excludes FD 34.
	Observed deficiencies	\$4.0M	Total cost of 2023-2028 OD. Excludes FS 11.
	Predicted renewals	\$4.3M	Total cost of 2029-2032 PR. Partial exclusion of FS 11.
	Opportunity projects	\$1.4M	50% of total cost of OP. Excludes FS 11 and 12.
2033-2040	FS 12 land acquisition	\$10.0M	Cost from Fire Functional Plan (1.25 acre minimum)
2033-2040	FS 12 construct replacement	\$30.0M	Cost from Fire Functional Plan (20,000 square feet minimum). Maintenance costs assume 2036 opening.

TIMEFRAME	PROJECT	ROM COST	NOTES
2033-2040	FS 12 old property sale or lease	TBD	Not estimated
2033-2040	Routine maintenance		Costs from 2023 FCA. Excludes FD 34.
	Predicted renewals	\$6.4M	Total cost of 2033-2040 PR. Excludes FS 11 and 12.
	Opportunity projects	\$1.4M	50% of total cost of OP. Excludes FS 11 and 12.
	New FS 11 and 12 estimate	\$2.6M	Based on a percentage of building construction cost per year. Costs from Fire Functional Plan.
2041-2050	FS 16 lifecycle renovation	\$12.0M	Cost from Fire Functional Plan
2041-2050	Apparatus Maintenance Facility lifecycle renovation	TBD	Not estimated
2041-2050	Routine maintenance		Costs from 2023 FCA. Excludes FD 34.
	Predicted renewals	\$0.5M	Total cost of 2041-2042 PR
	Existing facilities 2043+	\$3.9M	Based on a percentage of CRV per year.
	New FS 11 and 12 estimate	\$13.0M	Based on a percentage of building construction cost per year. Cost from Fire Functional Plan.
2051+	FS 11 replacement acquire land	TBD	Needed if level of service dictates a second station in the Downtown area (FS 19), and FS 11 is replaced in a new location. If FS 11 study recommends earlier replacement, project listing will be revised.
2051+	FS 11 construct replacement	\$35.0M	
2051+	FS 19 acquire land	TBD	Not estimated
2051+	FS 19 construction	\$35M	Cost from Fire Functional Plan
2051+	FS 17 lifecycle renovation	TBD	Not estimated
2051+	Fire training facility	TBD	Not estimated


The project lists use the following abbreviations:

FCA = 2023 Facility Conditions Assessment  
 OD = observed deficiency  
 PR = predicted renewal  
 OP = opportunity project  
 CRV = current replacement value  
 CIP = Capital Investment Program

ROM = rough order of magnitude  
 M = million dollars  
 FS = Fire Station  
 FD 34 = Fire District 34  
 MOC = Maintenance & Operations Center  
 EV = electric vehicle



### 3.3 – Police



Location of Police facilities on the municipal campus



#### Police Fast Facts

- 1 primary facility
- 3 buildings
- 97,255 gross square feet
- 134 staff

The Police Department (Police) operates one primary facility within the service area, which consists of Redmond city limits (17 square miles). Four workstations are located at several fire stations and the private Microsoft campus and are available for use by officers in the field.

Capital Facility Element policy CF-6 establishes this level of service for Police Department services:

- *Police capital facility needs are associated with police services, general operations, special operations and support services. The service standard is to have facilities and equipment sufficient to meet the demand for police services and to meet needs of staff assigned to service delivery.*
- *Ensure emergency response times meet community expectations and call response types.*

---

## Key Findings

### Public Safety Building

8701 160th Ave NE, Redmond, WA 98052





#### *Public Safety Building*

The Public Safety Building (PSB) is the headquarters and primary facility for Police. The building served as both City Hall and the police station until 2005, when the separate City Hall building opened. The PSB consists of administration office space and workspace for patrol officers. It also hosts a variety of specialized functions, including the City's 911 dispatch center, the City's data center, suspect holding and interview areas, an armory, evidence storage and processing labs, and locker rooms. The basement level hosts a firing range, parking for police personnel and fleet vehicles, and bulk evidence storage. The building features an emergency generator. The PSB is one of several buildings on the Redmond municipal campus.

The building has maintenance issues that stem from its original design and its conversion to an exclusive Police facility. It is inefficiently configured and the building systems are challenging and costly to maintain, with HVAC and electrical systems near their end of life. Because the backlog of maintenance is outpacing the building's current replacement value, 2023 FCA found that the building's condition worsened since the 2013 FCA. This is despite recent investments of approximately \$13.5 million, demonstrating the building's significant maintenance needs. From 2015 to the present, maintenance work included a seismic retrofit, exterior siding and roof replacement, replacement of heat pumps and HVAC components, 911 center remodel, and locker room upgrades.

Key functional issues include:

- The building is undersized for projected 2050 staff growth, which may be more than double current staff levels
- Incremental renovations over time are not well-served by the building's HVAC and electrical systems, which are reaching the end of their service lives
- Operational elements like the vehicle evidence pens, fleet parking, armory, training spaces, and dispatch center are at capacity
- Windowless offices, poor radio communications, seismic bracing, inefficient circulation, and other issues reduce occupant comfort and efficient workflow
- The Mobile Command post is an oversized vehicle without adequate secure parking
- Seasonal flooding of the basement garage is a major nuisance



The Public Safety Building requires a major decision, so alternatives are explored below in the section Public Safety Building Alternatives Evaluation.

## North and South Garage Buildings

8701 160th Ave NE, Redmond, WA 98052


These are two small buildings adjacent to the Public Safety Building. Originally used for specialized vehicle storage, today the North Garage is used for bike patrol storage and the South Garage is used for tactical training.

---

## Public Safety Building Alternatives Evaluation

Approaches to address the Public Safety Building issues and meet future needs are described and shown below.

- **Alternative 1:** Renovate for the near-term, with a replacement in the long-term. This would address critical functional issues and risks in the current building to meet all needs while delaying replacement. Renovating before replacing will add to the total project cost.
- **Alternative 2:** Replacement in the medium-term. Replacing on a quicker timeline would avoid steeper maintenance and renovation costs for the current building. The floor area would be larger based on future staffing needs.



Alt 1: Renovate Soon, Replace Later

Alt 2: Replace Soon

*Illustrations of the two potential alternatives for the Public Safety Building*

## Summary Recommendations and Project List

### Public Safety Building

#### Recommendation: Pursue Alternative 2

The Public Safety Building should be replaced in the medium-term. Retaining the building for its full-service life through 2045 or beyond would likely require significant investment to keep its systems fully operational but would not address the core facility issues. Therefore, replacing the facility in the 2033-2040 timeframe is recommended. Replacement is recommended in the latter half of that timeframe due to project cost and accommodating higher priority fire station replacements in the same period.

The expense and inconvenience of temporary police facilities during construction should be avoided. The facility would ideally be replaced on the Redmond municipal campus, which offers good citywide access, proximity to the growing population density of Downtown and Marymoor Village, and adjacency to city administration. Alternatively, if it is deemed advantageous for Fire Station 11 to relocate to the municipal campus (see 3.7 – Municipal Campus Considerations), and if there is no longer space to rebuild the PSB, the Fire Station 11 site could be considered for the PSB.

---

## North and South Garage Buildings

These two small structures are functionally integrated with the Public Safety Building. No major projects are planned. Their functions should be replaced at the same time as the Public Safety Building. It may be ideal for their functions to be integrated into the Public Safety Building replacement for ease of access and to reduce the extra costs of building and maintaining exterior enclosures.

## Overlake Precinct

The Police Functional Plan identifies a need for a precinct in the Overlake growth center to serve the growing population density and more efficiently dispatch to calls in southern areas of Redmond. The precinct would house commissioned officers and fleet vehicles, professional support staff (including a customer service desk), and could also support functions like records storage and training spaces, if advantageous. The Public Safety Building replacement in Downtown would continue functioning as the headquarters, supporting most staff and specialized functions.

Similar to the replacement of Fire Station 12, developing a precinct in Overlake will require the acquisition of new land, which is challenging proposition due to limited availability and high cost. The City has preliminarily identified a potential site at Redmond Technology Station, known as the “remainder parcel”, at the corner of 156th Avenue NE and NE 36th Street. The 1.6 acre parcel is currently owned by Sound Transit and Microsoft has the first right of refusal as it was originally owned by Microsoft before Sound Transit acquired it for light rail construction. The City has considered concepts for a vertical mixed-use facility at this location, potentially including police and community functions co-located with a replacement of Fire Station 12.



*Redmond Technology Station. The “remainder parcel” is the vacant area on the southeast corner.*

Should the “remainder parcel” prove unavailable, there are other potential sites in the area owned by Microsoft and other private landowners. The estimated property acquisition cost reflects a site size of 0.75 to 1 acre for the precinct, reflecting a potential mix of structured

and surface parking. A larger site would be needed for co-location with a fire station or other public facilities.

A private development partnership may be challenging because of the complex design requirements of police facilities. The new incentive program can be used to help offset some of the costs and encourage colocation (see RZC 21.55).

## Police Project List

TIMEFRAME	PROJECT	ROM COST	NOTES
2025-2026	PSB Phase 2 mechanical and electrical improvements	\$3.9M	Cost from Current CIP 2025-2030
2027-2032	Overlake Precinct land acquisition	\$6-8M	Cost from MAKERS analysis of King County real estate assessed values and sales data for 0.75 - 1 acres
2027-2032	Routine maintenance		Costs from 2023 FCA
	Observed deficiencies	\$3.6M	50% of total cost of 2023-2028 OD
	Predicted renewals	\$8.2M	50% of total cost of 2029-2032 PR
	Opportunity projects	\$0.0M	0% of total cost of OP
2033-2040	PSB construct replacement	\$100-110M	Cost range for 51,000 - 59,000 square feet staffed area plus 66,000 square feet secure parking. Costs from MAKERS and ACC. Maintenance costs assume 2039 opening.
2033-2040	Routine maintenance		Costs from 2023 FCA
	Predicted renewals	\$0.0M	0% of total cost of 2033-2040 PR
	Opportunity projects	\$0.0M	0% of total cost of OP
	New PSB estimate	\$2.0M	Based on a percentage of building construction cost per year. Costs from MAKERS and ACC.
2041-2050	Overlake Precinct construction	\$31-38M	Cost range for 20,000 - 25,000 square feet building and 0.75 - 1 acre site development. Costs from MAKERS and ACC. Maintenance costs assume 2044 opening.
2041-2050	Routine maintenance		Costs from 2023 FCA
	New PSB and Overlake Precinct estimate	\$12.2M	Based on a percentage of building construction cost per year. Costs from MAKERS and ACC.

For notes on project lists, see Section 4.3. The project lists use the following abbreviations:

FCA = 2023 Facility Conditions Assessment  
 OD = observed deficiency  
 PR = predicted renewal  
 OP = opportunity project  
 CRV = current replacement value

CIP = Capital Investment Program  
 ROM = rough order of magnitude  
 M = million dollars  
 PSB = Public Safety Building

## 3.4 – Maintenance & Operations



*Aerial view of the Maintenance & Operations Center*



### **Maintenance & Operations Fast Facts**

1 facility  
14 buildings  
62,000 gross square feet  
151 staff

The Public Works Department manages environmental services, maintains most fleet vehicles, builds and maintains Redmond’s infrastructure for streets, trails, water, wastewater, and sewer. The Parks Operations group develops and maintains city parks and facilities. The facilities maintenance team is also part of Parks Operations.

Capital Facility Element policy CF-6 establishes this level of service for general government facilities:

- *Facilities that are safe and meet all applicable health, safety, and accessibility standards.*
- *Facilities that are properly sized, designed for their intended purpose, and evolve to meet future demands, such as population growth, expanded infrastructure, and changes in regulatory requirements.*
- *Critical facilities are built or upgraded to standards that increase the likelihood that vital services continue in the event of a disaster.*
- *Constructed to support the equitable provision and use of facilities for all users.*

## Key Findings

### Maintenance & Operations Center

18080 NE 76th St, Redmond, WA 98052

Operational workgroups for Public Works, Parks Operations, and Facilities maintenance are based at the Maintenance & Operations Center (MOC) in southeast Redmond. Engineering and planning staff are located at City Hall. Other Public Works and non-recreation Parks buildings are outside the CFP scope, including utility structures and small maintenance buildings.

The MOC has fourteen major and minor structures, including administrative offices, crew support spaces, shops, a decant facility, a fuel station used by all City departments, and storage for vehicles and materials.

The MOC was built piecemeal over time. Most buildings are in poor condition and do not adequately support efficient operations. Functional issues include:

- Crew reporting, dispatch, and meeting areas are undersized and are inefficiently configured
- Workgroups are siloed in multiple buildings, precluding interdepartmental collaboration and efficient use of limited site area
- The warehousing and storage facilities are undersized and decentralized, hindering efficient inventory control
- The fleet shop is undersized and is not equipped to service large vehicles
- The site design is inefficient, and fleet and staff parking are at capacity





# Summary Recommendations and Project List

## Maintenance & Operations Center

Redevelopment of the MOC campus was identified as a priority in the 2019 Redmond Facilities Strategic Management Plan. The project is now underway, with a Master Plan completed in 2024 design development ongoing. Construction is in design development and anticipated to be completed in 2030.

This is currently Redmond’s largest general government facilities project. The project will meet almost all facilities needs of the Maintenance & Operations functional area through 2050.

The basic program (subject to change) is:

- Approximately 90,000 square foot operations building
- Approximately 99,000 square foot parking structure
- Approximately 60,000 square feet of fleet parking
- Approximately 14,000 square feet of covered exterior storage, fuel station, wash bays, and material bays

Construction will require the temporary relocation of crews, fleet, and materials. Consider interim locations during MOC reconstruction such as utility sites, surplus space on community center properties and the municipal campus, other City-owned properties, or if necessary short-term lease(s) of private property.

The Fire Functional Plan assumes a \$5M contribution to the MOC redevelopment to support the Fire Department’s logistics needs. If feasible, this should be incorporated to efficiently consolidate City inventories and address this need for the long term.

## Project List

For notes on project lists, see Section 4.3.

TIMEFRAME	PROJECT	ROM COST	NOTES
2025-2026	MOC redevelopment	\$26.8M	Cost from Current CIP 2025-2030
2027-2032	MOC redevelopment	\$198.2M	Total cost from City minus current CIP allocation. Maintenance assumes 2030 opening.
2027-2032	Routine maintenance - New MOC	\$3.1M	Based on a percentage of building construction cost per year. Cost from CIP and Master Plan.
2033-2040	Routine maintenance - New MOC	\$25.0M	Based on a percentage of building construction cost per year. Cost from CIP and Master Plan.
2041-2050	Routine maintenance - New MOC	\$46.9M	Based on a percentage of building construction cost per year. Cost from CIP and Master Plan.

---

The project lists use the following abbreviations:

FCA = 2023 Facility Conditions Assessment

MOC = Maintenance & Operations Center

OD = observed deficiency

PR = predicted renewal

OP = opportunity project

CRV = current replacement value

CIP = Capital Investment Program

ROM = rough order of magnitude

M = million dollars


DRAFT

## 3.5 – Indoor Recreation

The Redmond Parks & Recreation Department operates city parks and indoor recreation facilities for use by the general public. Four recreation facilities support cultural, athletic, and educational programming: Redmond Pool at Hartman Park, the Old Fire House Teen Center, the Redmond Senior & Community Center (RSCC), and the Redmond Community Center at Marymoor Village (RCCMV).

Capital Facility Element policy CF-6 establishes this level of service for parks and recreational facilities: *Provide recreational opportunities for all residents through sufficient and equitably distributed parks, trails, and recreational facilities.*

- *Percent of households within a ½ mile of developed city park.*
- *Percent of households within a ½ mile of trail access.*
- *Acreage of parkland per capita.*
- *Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) Level of Service Metrics.*



### Indoor Recreation Fast Facts

4 facilities  
4 buildings  
24,532 gross square feet  
15 staff

---

## Key Findings

### Redmond Senior & Community Center (RSCC)

8703 160th Ave NE, Redmond, WA 98052



The RSCC is Redmond’s newest general government facility, having opened in May 2024 with a cost of approximately \$63M. It is a two-story facility featuring a senior lounge, library, gymnasium, commercial kitchen, a variety of meeting rooms, and outdoor event space facing the Sammamish River. The facility provides regular programming for all ages and also has spaces available for rent. The RSCC is one of several buildings on the Redmond municipal campus and shares parking with other facilities.

There are minor maintenance and functional issues that will need to be addressed, such as improving acoustic insulation in several meeting rooms, a difficult-to-use glass door divider between the senior lounge and library, and challenging ADA access to the Red Oak room stage.

As part the City’s decarbonization strategy, the RSCC is also Redmond’s first all-electric public facility. Compared to a typical building, this means space and water heating are accomplished with electricity instead of natural gas. New equipment presents a learning curve for maintenance staff but also creates opportunities to learn and apply lessons to future upgrades and all-electric facilities across the City’s portfolio.

The building may be used as an emergency shelter, but it cannot be officially designated as such because it is in a 100-year flood plain. Relatedly, because the building is all-electric it has high electric demands that would require a very large emergency generator, so instead the building is set up for connecting to a portable generator. However, a study has found the building is well-positioned for battery storage as an alternative resilience measure if physical space is available.

---

## Redmond Community Center at Marymoor Village (RCCMV)

6505 176th Ave NE, Redmond, WA 98052



The City of Redmond has leased this property from the Lake Washington Institute of Technology (LWIT) since 2018. Originally built as a college classroom building, it features a small auditorium and a series of meeting rooms across two floors. The facility provides programming focused on physical activity, youth, and summer camps. In early 2025, teen programming was relocated from Old Fire House Teen Center to RCCMV.

RCCMV is located in the Marymoor Village growth center adjacent to Marymoor Park and three blocks from a light rail station. It is ideally positioned to support a growing residential population in a designated urban center.

Functional issues include:

- Limited capacity for staff growth
- Limited storage capacity, particularly on the second floor
- Common areas are limited and the lobby size is inadequate
- The kitchen is underused and not applicable to the building's current programming
- The auditorium is not configured for live music and other social activities that are associated with the building's current programming
- Teen programming is spread throughout the building, which is not ideal due to the program's size, specialized features, and unique user needs
- Outdated A/V technology, poor acoustics, and poor lighting control are an issue in many of the multipurpose rooms.
- The building lacks an emergency generator to support its potential designation as an emergency shelter
- Vehicular circulation on the site is constrained during peak times

---

The City and LWIT have expressed mutual interest in exchanging ownership of the full property (building and land). Once the City controls the property, it would allow for a right sizing of the spaces, capital investment in areas of concern, and increased improvements to improve usability. While the building was not originally built for use as a community center, the property has ample space for increasing the footprint and improving the facility for expanded recreational programming in the future.

## Old Fire House Teen Center

16510 NE 79th St, Redmond, WA 98052



This facility was originally built as a fire station and then was converted to a teen center in the 1990's. Due to safety concerns and maintenance challenges, in early 2025 teen services were relocated from this facility to RCCMV and the building currently is vacant. When active the building has been well-liked by users, but its cellular organization of spaces does not support its program well.

Functional issues include:

- A renovation may improve the quality of some spaces but would not result in a more open floor plan due to space limitations
- All building systems are in need of investment and replacement. For example, the original windows and building envelope have allowed water penetration.
- A previous retrofit did not meet earthquake design standards. The hose tower is not seismically reinforced and requires a retrofit or demolition.
- Any renovations will require significant hazard material abatement

---

## Redmond Pool

17535 NE 104th St, Redmond, WA 98052



Redmond Pool, located within Hartman Park, is the only public pool in Redmond and the surrounding area. It is used by recreational and competitive users, including school swim teams. Staffing is contracted to a nonprofit organization.

The facility is one of the oldest in Redmond's portfolio. It was in deteriorating condition and at risk of closing, but a major investment completed in 2021 gave the facility new life. A \$9.3 million investment provided a new roof, new water filtration and HVAC systems, and fully renovated the locker rooms and lobby.

Functional issues include:

- The pool is undersized given its popularity and it is outmoded compared to modern aquatic centers
- Lack of storage for materials and program supplies
- The pool deck has accessibility challenges
- Parking is limited and inefficiently designed

---

## Summary Recommendations and Project List

### Redmond Senior & Community Center

The RSCC will reach the midpoint of a typical 55-year service life beyond the 2050 planning horizon. No major projects are planned for this facility.

### Redmond Community Center at Marymoor Village

Assuming City ownership of the property, a major renovation is recommended to improve its functionality. The building requires upgrades to various systems and equipment to better serve recreation programs.

The scope of renovations may include:

- Audio/video technology upgrades
- Enlarged common spaces
- Increased program storage
- Removal of kitchen facility
- Consolidation of teen programming (if remaining at this location)
- Adding an emergency generator

Assuming City ownership of the property, as it approaches the end of its service life a reinvestment study is recommended to evaluate the best use and design of the facility and its property for continuing to meet recreation program needs of a growing population. The property is large and could host a variety of additional indoor and outdoor recreation programs in either an expanded building, a second building, a new building that replaces and expands on the existing functionality, or other configurations.

### Old Fire House Teen Center

A separate planning process is underway to determine the future of the facility.

### Redmond Pool

Even with recent investments, the pool building is far beyond its expected service life of 30 years. In the long-term the City should study options to replace this facility and meet the increasing demand for pool access.

Options to evaluate may include:

- Rebuilding a modest community-focused aquatic center in the same location, leaving additional demand for services to be met by other agencies or the private market
- Rebuilding a larger and more modern aquatic center at the same location
- Building a larger and more modern aquatic center in a more central location
- Replacing the facility and adding a second aquatic center in another location, such as the Marymoor or Overlake growth centers (ideally co-located with a community center)



- 
- Partnering with a neighboring city or school district on a jointly funded and owned regional aquatic center
  - Partnering with a private/nonprofit partner to develop a second aquatic center
  - Operating a single pool and leaving additional demand to the private market

## Overlake Community Center

As noted in Section 1.2 – Facility Planning Principles, the neighborhood is underserved for a community center with indoor recreation. The Redmond 2050 Comprehensive Plan and its [Overlake Neighborhood Plan Addendum](#), along with the Redmond Parks, Arts, Recreation, Culture & Conservation (PARCC) Plan elaborate on this need and say, “The new center could be a stand-alone facility or a partnership with a developer or another jurisdiction, and it should include amenities such as a gymnasium, fitness rooms, community meeting rooms, a general social living room area.”

The City has preliminarily identified a potential site at Redmond Technology Station, known as the “remainder parcel”, that is at the corner of 156th Avenue NE and NE 36th Street. The 1.6 acre parcel is currently owned by Sound Transit and Microsoft has the first right of refusal since the site was originally owned by Microsoft before it was acquired for light rail construction. The City has considered concepts for a vertical mixed-use facility at this location, potentially including a community center co-located with a replacement of Fire Station 12 and a police facility. Should this “remainder parcel” prove unavailable, there are other potential sites in the area owned by Microsoft and other private landowners.

The rough estimate of area needed for this facility is between 40,000 and 60,000 square feet, to be refined during design. The required land area will vary, but for planning purposes, a stand-alone, two-story, 40,000-60,000 square foot community center would likely require a site of between 0.75-2 acres, depending on the number of stories, parking configuration and structure, the extent of outdoor recreation features, etc.

Given limited available land, opportunities to include this facility in a multi-story private mixed-use development should be explored. A community center in a mixed-use building (e.g. with residential and/or commercial space) may limit its potential size or require multiple projects to offer the quantity and variety of desired recreational programming. According to the Redmond PARCC plan, “...*the City should be flexible and creative in its approach to provide indoor recreation space that is open to the public. Development incentives for new mixed used buildings to provide indoor meeting space, black box theaters, or other recreation space that is open to the public should be pursued.*”

Redmond Zoning Code 21.55.1000 provides a private development incentive for inclusion of a “community center or library (20,000 sq. ft. minimum)” in Overlake.

## Project List

For notes on project lists, see Section 4.3.

TIMEFRAME	PROJECT	ROM COST	NOTES
2025-2026	RCCMV property acquisition	\$18.5M	Cost from City staff
2027-2032	RCCMV reinvestment study	\$0.5M	Cost from MAKERS
2027-2032	RCCMV renovations	\$8.6M	To be refined pending results of reinvestment study. Cost from MAKERS and ACC OR.
2027-2032	Old Fire House Teen Center project	TBD	Not estimated; a separate planning process underway will provide recommendations.
2027-2032	Routine maintenance		Costs from 2023 FCA. Excludes OFHTC.
	Observed deficiencies	\$3.8M	Total cost of 2023-2028 OD
	Predicted renewals	\$8.7M	Total cost of 2029-2032 PR
	Opportunity projects	\$4.3M	50% of total cost of OP
	New RSCC estimate	\$2.9M	Based on a percentage of building construction cost per year. Cost from City.
2033-2040	Overlake community center land acquisition	\$6-16M	Cost from MAKERS analysis of King County real estate assessed values and sales data for 0.75 - 2 acres.
2033-2040	Pool replacement study	\$0.5M	Cost from MAKERS
2033-2040	Routine maintenance		Costs from 2023 FCA. Excludes OFHTC.
	Predicted renewals	\$16.5M	Total cost of 2033-2040 PR
	Opportunity projects	\$4.3M	50% of total cost of OP
	New RSCC estimate	\$7.8M	Based on a percentage of building construction cost per year. Cost from City.
2041-2050	Overlake community center construction	\$52-81M	Cost range for 40,000 - 60,000 square feet building and 0.75 - 2 acre site development. Costs from MAKERS and ACC. Maintenance costs assume 2046 opening.
2041-2050	Routine maintenance		Costs from 2023 FCA. Excludes OFHTC.
	Predicted renewals	\$2.2M	Total cost of 2041-2042 PR
	Existing facilities 2043+	\$5.2M	Based on a percentage of CRV per year.
	New RSCC and OCC estimate	\$17.7M	Based on a percentage of building construction cost per year. Costs from City, MAKERS, and ACC.
2051+	Pool replacement	TBD	Not estimated
2051+	RCCMV reinvestment	TBD	Not estimated

---


The project lists use the following abbreviations:

FCA = 2023 Facility Conditions Assessment  
OD = observed deficiency  
PR = predicted renewal  
OP = opportunity project  
CRV = current replacement value  
CIP = Capital Investment Program  
ROM = rough order of magnitude  
M = million dollars

OFHTC = Old Fire House Teen Center  
RSCC = Redmond Senior & Community Center  
RCCMV = Redmond Community Center at  
Marymoor Village  
OCC = Overlake Community Center

DRAFT

## 3.6 – Administration



Location of Administration facilities on the municipal campus



### Administration Fast Facts

2 facilities  
239,027 gross square feet  
284 staff at City Hall

Administration facilities are those not covered by other functional areas. Administration represents a large share of City staff and functions, including elected officials, finance, human resources, information technology, development services, economic development, and environmental sustainability. It also represents some administrative components of functional areas including Fire, Maintenance & Operations, and Parks.

Capital Facility Element policy CF-6 establishes this level of service for general government facilities:

- *Facilities that are safe and meet all applicable health, safety, and accessibility standards.*
- *Facilities that are properly sized, designed for their intended purpose, and evolve to meet future demands, such as population growth, expanded infrastructure, and changes in regulatory requirements.*
- *Critical facilities are built or upgraded to standards that increase the likelihood that vital services continue in the event of a disaster.*
- *Constructed to support the equitable provision and use of facilities for all users.*

---

## Key Findings

### City Hall

15670 NE 85th St, Redmond, WA 98052



City Hall is the primary facility for Administration, housing most city department offices, City Council chambers, and several public-facing uses such as conference rooms and a customer service center used for permitting, business licenses, and bill payment. The building includes the primary emergency operations center and features an emergency generator. All departments except Police have a staff presence at City Hall. City Hall is one of several buildings on the Redmond municipal campus.

City Hall and the Municipal Parking Garage were built for the City by Wright Runstad in a public-private partnership. Ownership was transferred to the City in 2013. Building management is contracted to CBRE.

A renovation of City Hall's ground floor addressed security concerns and added a ground floor customer service center and meeting spaces. A reorganization of office space and workgroups was completed in 2025 to improve adjacencies and recapture some underutilized areas on all floors.

Functional issues include:

- City Hall is underutilized due to hybrid/remote work policies
- Space on most floors of City Hall could be used more efficiently, e.g. smaller cubicles and less dedicated desks with more emphasis on hoteling or desk sharing
- The HVAC system is at midlife and has balancing issues
- City Hall is far removed from the Overlake growth center, which limits face-to-face public access to City customer service for residents of a large and growing neighborhood

---

## Municipal Parking Garage

8711 160th Ave NE, Redmond, WA 98052



This four-story facility is for municipal campus visitors, City staff personal vehicles, and some City fleet vehicles. It has 314 parking spaces. With the opening of the RSCC the first level of the garage is reserved for RSCC visitors and levels 2-4 are reserved for City use.

No notable functional issues were observed.

## Summary Recommendations and Project List

### City Hall

There may be space available to host administrative staff from other facilities when those facilities are being renovated or under construction.

This facility will be due for lifecycle renovations during the planning period. No other major projects are planned for this facility.

### Municipal Parking Garage

This facility will be due for lifecycle renovations during the planning period. No other major projects are planned for this facility.

### Overlake Administrative Annex

An Administration and customer service presence has long been targeted for the Overlake growth center, and as noted in Section 1.2 – Facility Planning Principles the neighborhood is underserved. To meet this need in the near-term the City is planning to purchase a commercial condominium at an affordable housing development adjacent to the Overlake Village Station. This space is anticipated to open in 2028.

Should the City require additional or larger space in the area, co-location of Administration functions with another facility investment in Overlake (such as a community center) could be considered.

## Project List

For notes on project lists, see Section 4.3.

TIMEFRAME	PROJECT	ROM COST	NOTES
2025-2026	City Hall workspace remodel	\$0.3M	Cost from Current CIP 2025-2030
2025-2026	City Hall pond refurbishment	\$0.3M	Cost from Current CIP 2025-2030
2025-2026	EV charging stations at Municipal Parking Garage	\$0.8M	Cost from Current CIP 2025-2030
2025-2026	Overlake administrative annex space purchase	\$0.6M	1,600 square feet commercial condominium. Cost from Current CIP 2025-2030.
2027-2032	Routine maintenance		Costs from 2023 FCA
	Observed deficiencies	\$2.8M	Total cost of 2023-2028 OD
	Predicted renewals	\$2.3M	Total cost of 2029-2032 PR
	Opportunity projects	\$15.3M	50% of total cost of OP
2033-2040	City Hall lifecycle renovation	\$16.7M	Total cost of PR and 50% of total cost of OP for 2033-2040
2033-2040	Routine maintenance		Costs from 2023 FCA
	Predicted renewals	\$1.7M	Total cost of 2033-2040 PR. Municipal Parking Garage only.
	Opportunity projects	\$0.4M	50% of total cost of OP. Municipal Parking Garage only.
2041-2050	Routine maintenance		Costs from 2023 FCA
	Predicted renewals	\$0.9M	Total cost of 2041-2042 PR
	Existing facilities 2043+	\$20.4M	Based on a percentage of CRV per year

The project lists use the following abbreviations:

FCA = 2023 Facility Conditions Assessment      EV = electric vehicle  
 OD = observed deficiency  
 PR = predicted renewal  
 OP = opportunity project  
 CRV = current replacement value  
 CIP = Capital Investment Program  
 ROM = rough order of magnitude  
 M = million dollars

---

## 3.7 – Municipal Campus Considerations

Several capital investment decisions and CFP recommendations relate to use and development of the Redmond municipal campus, particularly for Police and Fire. Careful planning of the campus is necessary because it is one of the City’s few large landholdings available for general government facilities needs and acquiring additional land is time-consuming and costly.

A facilities-driven master plan process for the municipal campus is recommended to make decisions about the future use and development of the campus. The master plan would address these key issues through 2050:

- Being a potential location for Fire Station 11 replacement, or a location for a temporary station while the existing FS 11 facility is renovated or redeveloped
- Being a likely location for replacement of the Public Safety Building
- Planned expansion of Well No. 4 capacity and new water treatment facilities
- Potential development of a new regional stormwater management facility
- Some open space on the campus is used for recreation and community events

While a campus master plan typically includes many components such as transportation, open space, and public benefits, such a master plan would need to be driven by general government facilities requirements due to Redmond’s public safety needs and limited public landholdings.





*Illustrative concept for a potential municipal campus vision*

Access is an important consideration for public safety facilities. If Fire Station 11 is replaced on the campus, the apparatus bay ideally has immediate access to the street network to minimize response times in its coverage area. The most available street frontage on the campus is 160th Avenue NE on the east side of the campus. If the Public Safety Building is rebuilt on the campus, close access to the street network is less critical because officers are on patrol in their vehicles throughout the city.

## Well No. 4

Redmond Public Works operates Well No. 4 on the east side of the municipal campus to provide critical freshwater supplies for the city. The well is contained within a small utility structure next to the Public Safety Building. Physical and legal (water rights) challenges around water wells mean Well No. 4 will most likely remain in its current location.

As of 2025, the well is temporarily offline while water quality and production issues are evaluated. Public Works is assessing the need to potential build a second well on the campus, provide new treatment for per- and polyfluoroalkyl chemicals (PFAS, commonly

---

referred to as “forever chemicals”), and provide new greensand filtration for removing iron, manganese, hydrogen sulfide, and arsenic.

Combined, these new water facilities may require up to 25,000 square feet of site area, or more than half an acre. If these facilities are consolidated and if campus access to 160th Ave NE is reconfigured, these new facilities can be accommodated in campus open spaces south or east of Well No. 4.

## Stormwater Management

Public Works has preliminarily identified the need for a regional stormwater management facility in the vicinity of the municipal campus. No further details are available at the time of this writing. The concept needs to be further scoped before implications for general government facilities planning can be evaluated. Alternatives for underground facilities and locations off the campus are recommended for evaluation.

## Open Spaces/Lawns

The “Great Lawn” between City Hall and the Redmond Senior & Community Center is frequently used for community events and likely needs to be preserved. Enhancing public use areas and open spaces should be a goal of the master planning process.

## Opportunity Projects

The 2023 Facility Condition Assessment identified several major opportunity projects for the campus that could be further assessed by a master planning effort:

- Flood risk planning and mitigation. This includes a resiliency study and potential for modest flood mitigation at the current site, such as a flood wall and diesel-engine-powered high-capacity flood pumps, to protect mission-critical facilities.
- Installation of a ground-source heat pump system for multiple buildings, reducing natural gas use and carbon footprint. This could also support a “district energy” approach with shared resources between on-campus and off-campus properties for economy of scale.
- Installing a new vehicle fuel island to reduce fleet vehicle travel time and wear-and-tear to the MOC
- Installing covered pedestrian walkways between buildings on the campus, to improve pedestrian comfort during inclement weather
- Installing a “blue light” security system and lighting improvements to improve safety for visitors and staff

## Expansion Opportunities and Partnerships

A related issue is opportunities to expand the campus or partner with other agency users. As planning gets underway for reinvestment in Fire Station 11 and the Public Safety Building in the 2030’s, the City of Redmond should collaborate with King County to discuss plans related to the District Court and the Redmond Library, and explore opportunities to


---

partner to address facilities issues, improve the campus as a whole, and better serve the community. Public agency partnerships may offer unique tools for campus expansion that are not available with private land, such as free or discounted sales and land swaps. Redevelopment and infill opportunities at adjacent private properties should also be understood and considered, such as at the shopping center east of the campus.

DRAFT

# 4 – Capital Investment Strategy

The map below illustrates the locations of major capital investments recommended for Redmond’s general government facilities from 2027 to 2050. Investments with unknown locations are noted as such.



---

## 4.1 – Introduction

This section summarizes the recommendations by timeframe:

- **Near-term:** This represents the current budget biennium 2025-2026 and the next CIP interval 2027-2032 (6 calendar years)
- **Medium-term:** 2033-2040 (8 calendar years)
- **Long-term:** 2041-2050 (10 calendar years)
- **Beyond 2050**

## 4.2 – Prioritization Criteria

In addition to the adopted prioritization criteria in Redmond’s Capital Investment Strategy the CFP recommends these criteria for major capital projects and routine maintenance. Funding strategies and target implementation dates will be refined by City leadership.

### Major Capital Projects

Implementation of major capital projects should be prioritized based on timeframe and criticality:

1. Immediate and near-term projects that are currently underway or in the current budget biennium and the next CIP interval 2027-2032
2. Medium-term projects and projects identified as most critical based on the facility rankings in Section 2.3
3. Long-term projects and other non-urgent projects that support long-term population growth

### Routine Maintenance

Low, medium, and high priorities for maintenance at existing buildings are identified in the 2023 Facilities Condition Assessment. These priorities should be factored into routine maintenance planning and budgeting.

---

## 4.3 – Cost Estimates Overview

In this section, sources for costs are provided in the notes column of each project list. Some costs have a low-to-high range when the size of land acquisitions and new facilities is yet to be determined, and some costs are not provided where they are not yet available.

Hard costs for construction and renovation projects of new non-Fire facilities are based on historical projects from within the last 10 years (from the publication *RSMeans Historical Cost Index*), adjusted to 2025 dollars, and adjusted for location. Police facility hard costs also include an essential facilities markup of 15-20%. Additional markups include a 40% soft cost markup and a 20% planning contingency markup for non-Fire projects, and a 30% soft cost markup for Fire projects.

Cost escalation is factored as follows:

- Capital construction and renovation projects are in 2025 dollars
- Routine maintenance for observed deficiencies, predicted renewals, and opportunities from the 2023 Facilities Conditions Assessment are based on 2023 dollars escalated at 3% per year for two years to 2025
- Estimated routine maintenance needs for 2043+ at existing facilities included in the FCA are based on the current replacement value reported in 2023 escalated at 3% per year for two years to 2025
- Estimated routine maintenance needs for new facilities not included in the FCA do not have escalation and are based on construction costs for new buildings provided by the City or developed by MAKERS and ACC, with the exception of the RSCC which is escalated at 3% per year for one year to 2025

The costs of routine maintenance are provided in this CFP, drawing from the observed deficiencies, planned renewals, and opportunity projects documented in the 2023 Facility Conditions Assessment and major maintenance already planned in the Capital Investment Program. Observed deficiencies for current to 2032 include maintenance projects with budget dates back to 2023 because those observed deficiencies have not yet been addressed as of this writing. Opportunity costs, where implemented, are evenly split between the 2027-2032 and 2033-2040 timeframes.

The FCA is limited in scope to facilities existing in 2023 and has a time horizon extending only to 2042. Therefore, MAKERS has provided additional maintenance cost estimates for new buildings and extended cost estimates for existing buildings in 2043-2050. The estimates generally use the industry best practice of funding annual maintenance at a level equal to 3% of facility Current Replacement Value (“Committing to the Cost of Ownership: Maintenance and Repair of Public Buildings”, Committee on Advanced Maintenance Concepts for Buildings Research Board and Commission on Engineering and Technical Systems National Research Council, 1990). The calculation is adjusted for newer facilities as follows:

- First timeframe of facility life: 1% CRV

- 
- Second timeframe of facility life: 2% CRV
  - Third timeframe of facility life and beyond: 3% CRV

Where CRV is not available for new facilities, the known or estimated construction cost of new buildings is used (excluding site development costs).

The project lists use the following abbreviations:

FCA = 2023 Facility Conditions Assessment

OD = observed deficiency

PR = predicted renewal

OP = opportunity project

CRV = current replacement value

CIP = Capital Investment Program

ROM = rough order of magnitude

M = million dollars

FS = Fire Station

OFHTC = Old Fire House Teen Center

FD 34 = Fire District 34

PSB = Public Safety Building

MOC = Maintenance & Operations Center

RSCC = Redmond Senior & Community Center

RCCMV = Redmond Community Center at

Marymoor Village

OCC = Overlake Community Center

ADA = Americans with Disabilities Act

EV = electric vehicle

LED = light emitting diode

## 4.4 – Near-Term Actions (2025-2032)

The key areas of focus in this timeframe are:

- Citywide upgrades in energy efficiency and accessibility
- Redevelopment of the MOC
- Acquisition and renovation of the RCCMV
- Planning for the renovation or replacement of Fire Station 11
- Systems upgrades and modernization at multiple fire stations
- Tenant improvements at a leased warehouse for a Fire logistics facility
- Land acquisition in Overlake for a police precinct
- Purchasing office space in Overlake for an administrative annex

TIMEFRAME	PROJECT	ROM COST	NOTES
<b>CITYWIDE</b>			
2025-2026	Sustainability Building Automation (Energy Management System) - Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning Controls	\$0.5M	Cost from Current CIP 2025-2030
2025-2026	Sustainability LED Lighting Building Retrofit	\$0.9M	Cost from Current CIP 2025-2030
2025-2026	EV charging stations	\$0.1M	Cost from Current CIP 2025-2030
2025-2026	ADA Facilities Improvements	\$2.1M	Cost from Current CIP 2025-2030 (multiple line items)
2025-2026	Small capital projects	\$0.3M	Cost from Current CIP 2025-2030
2025-2026	Municipal Buildings Renovations, Maintenance and Repairs	\$1.5M	Cost from Current CIP 2025-2030
<b>FIRE</b>			
2025-2026	EV charging stations at fire stations	\$0.9M	FS 11 and FS 12. Cost from Fire Functional Plan.
2025-2026	Personal protective equipment storage upgrades	\$0.3M	Cost from Current CIP 2025-2030
2025-2026	FS 11 repairs	\$5.0M	Cost from Fire Functional Plan. Total cost of 2023-2028 OD and partial cost of 2029-2032 PR.
2025-2026	FS 17 interior buildout and admin relief	\$0.4M	Cost from Fire Functional Plan
2025-2026	FS 17 siding replacement	\$1.2M	Cost from Current CIP 2025-2030



TIMEFRAME	PROJECT	ROM COST	NOTES
2027-2032	Diesel exhaust upgrades	\$0.5M	Multiple stations. Cost from Fire Functional Plan.
2027-2032	Emergency generator upgrades	\$0.5M	Multiple stations. Cost from Fire Functional Plan.
2027-2032	FS 11 partial remodel (apparatus bay expansion)	\$1.6M	Cost from Fire Functional Plan
2027-2032	FS 11 renovation and replacement study	\$0.4M	Cost from Fire Functional Plan
2027-2032	FS 11 renovation or replacement	\$15.0M	Cost from Fire Functional Plan for renovation. Project type decision is pending study results.
2027-2032	Logistics - Tenant improvements to leased warehouse	\$0.6M	Cost from Fire Functional Plan
2027-2032	Logistics - City-owned investment	\$5.0M	New facility or shared storage at MOC. Cost from Fire Functional Plan.
2027-2032	Routine maintenance		Costs from 2023 FCA. Excludes FD 34.
2027-2032	Observed deficiencies	\$4.0M	Total cost of 2023-2028 OD. Excludes FS 11.
2027-2032	Predicted renewals	\$4.3M	Total cost of 2029-2032 PR. Partial exclusion of FS 11.
2027-2032	Opportunity projects	\$1.4M	50% of total cost of OP. Excludes FS 11 and 12.
<b>POLICE</b>			
2025-2026	PSB Phase 2 mechanical and electrical improvements	\$3.9M	Cost from Current CIP 2025-2030
2027-2032	Overlake Precinct land acquisition	\$6-8M	Cost from MAKERS analysis of King County real estate assessed values and sales data for 0.75 - 1 acres
2027-2032	Routine maintenance		Costs from 2023 FCA
2027-2032	Observed deficiencies	\$3.6M	50% of total cost of 2023-2028 OD
2027-2032	Predicted renewals	\$8.2M	50% of total cost of 2029-2032 PR
2027-2032	Opportunity projects	\$0.0M	0% of total cost of OP
<b>MAINTENANCE &amp; OPERATIONS</b>			
2025-2026	MOC redevelopment	\$26.8M	Cost from Current CIP 2025-2030
2027-2032	MOC redevelopment	\$198.2M	Total cost from City minus current CIP allocation. Maintenance assumes 2030 opening.
2027-2032	Routine maintenance - New MOC	\$3.1M	Based on a percentage of building construction cost per year. Cost from CIP and Master Plan.

TIMEFRAME	PROJECT	ROM COST	NOTES
<b>INDOOR RECREATION</b>			
2025-2026	RCCMV property acquisition	\$18.5M	Cost from City staff
2027-2032	RCCMV reinvestment study	\$0.5M	Cost from MAKERS
2027-2032	RCCMV renovations	\$8.6M	To be refined pending results of reinvestment study. Cost from MAKERS and ACC OR.
2027-2032	Old Fire House Teen Center project	TBD	Not estimated; a separate planning process underway will provide recommendations.
2027-2032	Routine maintenance		Costs from 2023 FCA. Excludes OFHTC.
2027-2032	Observed deficiencies	\$3.8M	Total cost of 2023-2028 OD
2027-2032	Predicted renewals	\$8.7M	Total cost of 2029-2032 PR
2027-2032	Opportunity projects	\$4.3M	50% of total cost of OP
2027-2032	New RSCC estimate	\$2.9M	Based on a percentage of building construction cost per year. Cost from City.
<b>ADMINISTRATION</b>			
2025-2026	City Hall workspace remodel	\$0.3M	Cost from Current CIP 2025-2030
2025-2026	City Hall pond refurbishment	\$0.3M	Cost from Current CIP 2025-2030
2025-2026	EV charging stations at Municipal Parking Garage	\$0.8M	Cost from Current CIP 2025-2030
2025-2026	Overlake administrative annex space purchase	\$0.6M	1,600 square feet commercial condominium. Cost from Current CIP 2025-2030.
2027-2032	Routine maintenance		Costs from 2023 FCA
2027-2032	Observed deficiencies	\$2.8M	Total cost of 2023-2028 OD
2027-2032	Predicted renewals	\$2.3M	Total cost of 2029-2032 PR
2027-2032	Opportunity projects	\$15.3M	50% of total cost of OP

## 4.5 – Medium-Term Actions (2033-2040)

The key areas of focus in this timeframe are:

- Replacing or renovating Fire Station 11, and replacing Fire Station 12
- Replacing the Public Safety Building
- Land acquisition in Overlake for a community center
- Planning to replace the Pool
- City Hall lifecycle renovation

TIMEFRAME	PROJECT	ROM COST	NOTES
<b>FIRE</b>			
2033-2040	FS 12 land acquisition	\$10.0M	Cost from Fire Functional Plan (1.25 acre minimum)
2033-2040	FS 12 construct replacement	\$30.0M	Cost from Fire Functional Plan (20,000 square feet minimum). Maintenance costs assume 2036 opening.
2033-2040	FS 12 old property sale or lease	TBD	Not estimated
2033-2040	Routine maintenance		Costs from 2023 FCA. Excludes FD 34.
2033-2040	Predicted renewals	\$6.4M	Total cost of 2033-2040 PR. Excludes FS 11 and 12.
2033-2040	Opportunity projects	\$1.4M	50% of total cost of OP. Excludes FS 11 and 12.
2033-2040	New FS 11 and 12 estimate	\$2.6M	Based on a percentage of building construction cost per year. Costs from Fire Functional Plan.
<b>POLICE</b>			
2033-2040	PSB construct replacement	\$100-110M	Cost range for 51,000 - 59,000 square feet staffed area plus 66,000 square feet secure parking. Costs from MAKERS and ACC. Maintenance costs assume 2039 opening.
2033-2040	Routine maintenance		Costs from 2023 FCA
2033-2040	Predicted renewals	\$0.0M	0% of total cost of 2033-2040 PR
2033-2040	Opportunity projects	\$0.0M	0% of total cost of OP
2033-2040	New PSB estimate	\$2.0M	Based on a percentage of building construction cost per year. Costs from MAKERS and ACC.
<b>MAINTENANCE &amp; OPERATIONS</b>			
2033-2040	Routine maintenance - New MOC	\$25.0M	Based on a percentage of building construction cost per year. Cost from CIP and Master Plan.

TIMEFRAME	PROJECT	ROM COST	NOTES
<b>INDOOR RECREATION</b>			
2033-2040	Overlake community center land acquisition	\$6-16M	Cost from MAKERS analysis of King County real estate assessed values and sales data for 0.75 - 2 acres
2033-2040	Pool replacement study	\$0.5M	Cost from MAKERS
2033-2040	Routine maintenance		Costs from 2023 FCA. Excludes OFHTC.
2033-2040	Predicted renewals	\$16.5M	Total cost of 2033-2040 PR
2033-2040	Opportunity projects	\$4.3M	50% of total cost of OP
2033-2040	New RSCC estimate	\$7.8M	Based on a percentage of building construction cost per year. Cost from City.
<b>ADMINISTRATION</b>			
2033-2040	City Hall lifecycle renovation	\$16.7M	Total cost of PR and 50% of total cost of OP for 2033-2040
2033-2040	Routine maintenance		Costs from 2023 FCA
2033-2040	Predicted renewals	\$1.7M	Total cost of 2033-2040 PR. Municipal parking garage only.
2033-2040	Opportunity projects	\$0.4M	50% of total cost of OP. Municipal parking garage only.

## 4.6 – Long-Term Actions (2041-2050)

The key areas of focus in this timeframe are:

- Constructing a police precinct in Overlake
- Constructing a community center in Overlake

TIMEFRAME	PROJECT	ROM COST	NOTES
<b>FIRE</b>			
2041-2050	FS 16 lifecycle renovation	\$12.0M	Cost from Fire Functional Plan
	Apparatus Maintenance Facility lifecycle renovation	TBD	Not estimated
2041-2050	Routine maintenance		Costs from 2023 FCA. Excludes FD 34.
2041-2050	Predicted renewals	\$0.5M	Total cost of 2041-2042 PR
2041-2050	Existing facilities 2043+	\$3.9M	Based on a percentage of CRV per year.
2041-2050	New FS 11 and 12 estimate	\$13.0M	Based on a percentage of building construction cost per year. Cost from Fire Functional Plan.
<b>POLICE</b>			
2041-2050	Overlake Precinct construction	\$31-38M	Cost range for 20,000 - 25,000 square feet building and 0.75 - 1 acre site development. Costs from MAKERS and ACC. Maintenance costs assume 2044 opening.
2041-2050	Routine maintenance		Costs from 2023 FCA
2041-2050	New PSB and Overlake Precinct estimate	\$12.2M	Based on a percentage of building construction cost per year. Costs from MAKERS and ACC.
<b>MAINTENANCE &amp; OPERATIONS</b>			
2041-2050	Routine maintenance - New MOC	\$46.9M	Based on a percentage of building construction cost per year. Cost from CIP and Master Plan.
<b>INDOOR RECRETATION</b>			
2041-2050	Overlake community center construction	\$52-81M	Cost range for 40,000 - 60,000 square feet building and 0.75 - 2 acre site development. Costs from MAKERS and ACC. Maintenance costs assume 2046 opening.
2041-2050	Routine maintenance		Costs from 2023 FCA. Excludes OFHTC.
2041-2050	Predicted renewals	\$2.2M	Total cost of 2041-2042 PR
2041-2050	Existing facilities 2043+	\$5.2M	Based on a percentage of CRV per year.

TIMEFRAME	PROJECT	ROM COST	NOTES
2041-2050	New RSCC and OCC estimate	\$17.7M	Based on a percentage of building construction cost per year. Costs from City, MAKERS, and ACC.
<b>ADMINISTRATION</b>			
2041-2050	Routine maintenance		Costs from 2023 FCA
2041-2050	Predicted renewals	\$0.9M	Total cost of 2041-2042 PR
2041-2050	Existing facilities 2043+	\$20.4M	Based on a percentage of CRV per year.

## 4.7 – Beyond 2050

The key areas of focus in this timeframe are:

- Replacing Fire Station 11 and constructing Fire Station 19
- Planning for a Fire training facility
- Replacing the Pool
- Reinvesting in the RCCMV

TIMEFRAME	PROJECT	ROM COST	NOTES
<b>FIRE</b>			
2051+	FS 11 replacement acquire land	TBD	Needed if level of service dictates a second station in the Downtown area (FS 19), and FS 11 is replaced in a new location. If FS 11 study recommends earlier replacement, project listing will be revised.
2051+	FS 11 construct replacement	\$35M	
2051+	FS 19 acquire land	TBD	Not estimated
2051+	FS 19 construct station	\$35M	Cost from Fire Functional Plan
2051+	FS 17 lifecycle renovation	TBD	Not estimated
2051+	Fire training facility	TBD	Not estimated
<b>INDOOR RECREATION</b>			
2051+	Pool construct replacement	TBD	Not estimated
2051+	RCCMV reinvestment	TBD	Not estimated