

PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Public Hearing on Point Wells Subarea Plan Amendment and modification of Map T-18 (Street Classifications) in the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan
DEPARTMENT:	Planning and Development Services
PRESENTED BY:	Joseph W. Tovar, FAICP, Director Steven Cohn, Senior Planner

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the public hearing is to hear testimony, deliberate and develop a recommendation on modifying a portion of the narrative and Policy PW-12 in the Point Wells Subarea Plan and amending Map T-18 in the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan. The modifications would change the designation of the portion of Richmond Beach Drive north of NW 199th to "neighborhood street" and clarify that the road might be designated as a collector arterial appropriate for more traffic if certain conditions are fulfilled.

BACKGROUND

The proposal entails the following changes: 1) modify Policy PW-12 and a portion of the narrative prior to PW-11 in the Point Wells Subarea Plan, and 2) modify a map in the Transportation Section of the Comprehensive Plan to reflect the PW-12 revision.

Comprehensive Plan Amendment hearings are held by the Planning Commission and the Commission's record and decision are forwarded to the City Council for a final decision.

The Commission held a study session on this topic on January 6, 2011. At the study session, the Commission requested additional information dealing with road classification and existing conditions. This information is available on Attachments 2, 3, and 4.

PROPOSAL & ANALYSIS

Proposed amendment to the text of the Point Wells Subarea Plan

(NOTE: The actual proposed amendments are the revision of the narrative, PW-12, which are shown with underlining, and the revised map)

Approved By:

Project Manager



Planning Director _____

Richmond Beach Road and Richmond Beach Drive provide the only vehicular access to Point Wells. Therefore, it is critical that identified impacts be effectively mitigated as a condition of approval. It is also vital that the scale of traffic generated from Point Wells be limited to preserve safety and the quality of residential neighborhoods along this road corridor.


Historically, mobility and accessibility in Richmond Beach and adjacent communities have been dominated by the single occupancy vehicle. Provision of bicycle and pedestrian facilities has been limited because retrofitting an existing road network with these facilities is an expensive undertaking. The Richmond Beach Road corridor is served by a single Metro limited Metro bus service route and is beyond a reasonable walking distance from potential development within Pt. Wells. ~~And Though~~ rail service to a station in Richmond Beach was evaluated by Sound Transit, no service is envisioned in the transit agency's adopted 20 year plan. ~~Though~~ Improved transit, bicycle, and pedestrian mobility is a long-term policy objective, but the majority of trips in the area will likely continue to be by automobiles utilizing the road network. The City's traffic study completed in 2009 shows that if more than 8,250 vehicle trips per day enter the City's road network from Point Wells, it would result in level of service "F" or worse at a number of City intersections. This would be an unacceptable impact.

Policy PW-11 The City should address opportunities to improve mobility, accessibility, and multimodal east-west movement in the Richmond Beach Road Corridor between Puget Sound and I-5 as part of the update of the city-wide Transportation Master Plan. These opportunities should be pursued in a manner that reduces existing single occupancy vehicle trips in the corridor.

~~Policy PW-12 The maximum daily traffic that the City should permit emanating from or entering into Point Wells may not exceed 8,250 vehicle trips per day nor reduce the City's adopted level of service standard for the Corridor at the time of application for development permits at Point Wells.~~

Policy PW-12 In view of the fact that Richmond Beach Drive between NW 199th St. and NW 205th St. is a dead-end local access road with no opportunities for alternative access to dozens of homes in Shoreline and Woodway, the City designates this as a local access street with a maximum capacity of 4,000 vehicle trips per day. Unless and until either Snohomish County or the owner of the Point Wells Urban Center can provide to the City the Transportation Corridor Study and Mitigation Plan called for in Policy PW-9, as well as financial and legal guarantees that the necessary mitigations will be provided, the City should not consider reclassifying this road segment as an arterial with a capacity of 8,250 vehicle trips per day. Intersection or other road improvements that would accommodate and encourage vehicle trips beyond those approved for the local access street (4000) or arterial (8,250) classification should not be permitted.

Proposed revision to Figure T-18-Street Classifications that implements the policy change and shows Richmond Beach Drive segment reclassified as a local access street



Decision Criteria

The Planning Commission may recommend and the City Council may approve, or approve with modifications an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan if the amendment complies with one or more of the following criteria:

1. The amendment is consistent with the Growth Management Act and not inconsistent with the Countywide Planning Policies and other provisions of the Comprehensive Plan policies; or
2. The amendment addresses changing circumstances, changing community values, incorporates a subarea plan consistent with the Comprehensive Plan vision or corrects information contained in the Comprehensive Plan; or
3. The amendment will benefit the community as a whole, will not adversely affect community facilities, the public health, safety or general welfare.

Analysis:

The proposed amendments to the City's Comprehensive Plan are consistent with the Growth Management Act, specifically, RCW 36.70A.020(12), which provides:

Ensure that those public facilities and services necessary to support development shall be adequate to serve the development at the time the development is available for occupancy and use without decreasing current service levels below locally established minimum standards.

The adoption of this policy is intended to implement RCW 36.70A.020(12) by calling for the transportation study described in the City's Comprehensive Plan be completed, and appropriate mitigations and funding sources identified, prior to changing the classification of the street so that it could handle additional traffic greater than 4000 average daily trips. In addition, the public health, safety and general welfare are improved because the traffic study will identify specific impacts and mitigations that will improve safety in the Richmond Beach corridor.

Once adopted, these proposed amendments to the City's comprehensive plan would guide future City actions regarding discussions with Snohomish County, Woodway and the owner of the Point Wells Urban Center in Snohomish County, as well as the City's processing and decision-making regarding street use or street cut permits, utility and service extensions in view of future development permit proposals at the Point Wells Urban Center in Snohomish County.

These proposed amendments to the Shoreline Comprehensive Plan would also inform any future environmental impact statement that is prepared describing the likely impacts and appropriate mitigations of a future project at the Point Wells Urban Center, of the City's adopted policy regarding the capacity and limitations of Richmond Beach Drive.

As of this writing, a pre-application neighborhood meeting has been advertised by the Point Wells developer. The meeting announcement suggests that the applicant might want to construct up to 3,500 housing units. The applicant's website estimates that the redevelopment would occur over a period of 10-20 years. The sole vehicular access to the Point Wells development is via Richmond Beach Drive. Under the provisions of the Snohomish County Code, the BSRE Point Wells, LP application for an Urban Center Development Permit, could vest thirty days after their January 27, 2011 neighborhood meeting.

RECOMMENDATION

Because the application meets the criteria for approval, the Planning Department recommends that the Planning Commission recommend to the Shoreline City Council that the proposed amendments to the City's Comprehensive Plan be adopted.

TIMING AND SCHEDULE

Summary of noticing and project review:

- Proposed City Plan Amendments sent to Department of Commerce on December 2, 2010
- State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Determination of Non-Significance for the proposed Plan Amendments was issued and the Washington State Department of Ecology notified - December 29, 2010
- City of Shoreline Planning Commission Study session - January 6, 2011
- Notice of January 20, 2011 Planning Commission Public Hearing was published in the Seattle Times on January 5, 2011
- In addition to the Seattle Times, information about the hearing was available on the city's website and patch.com.

Next Steps

At the January 20 hearing, the Commission will accept oral and written testimony on these proposals. At the conclusion of the testimony, the Commission will deliberate and may make its recommendation that evening. If you would like to email comments to the Planning Commission, send them to Plancom@shorelinewa.gov prior to 5 pm the day of the hearing.

If you have questions about the proposal, please contact Joe Tovar at 801-2501 or jtovar@shorelinewa.gov or Steve Cohn at 801-2511 or scohn@shorelinewa.gov.

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment 1** - List of Public Hearing Exhibits
- Attachment 2** - Existing Street Classification Map
- Attachment 3** - 2009 City of Shoreline Traffic Flow Map
- Attachment 4** - Table T-14 – General Description of Classified Streets
- Attachment 5** - Minutes from 12/3/09 Planning Commission Public Hearing on the Point Wells Subarea Plan
- Attachment 6** - Minutes from 12/10/09 Planning Commission Public Hearing on the Point Wells Subarea Plan
- Attachment 7** - Notice of Public Hearing
- Attachment 8** - SEPA Checklist, Threshold Determination
- Attachment 9** - 01/27/11 Pre-Application Neighborhood Meeting Notice from BSRE Point Wells, LP
- Attachment 10** - Public Comment Letters

This page intentionally blank




PUBLIC HEARING RECORD
Point Wells Subarea Plan Amendment
January 20, 2011 | List of Exhibits

- Exhibit 1** January 20, 2011 Staff Report “Public Hearing on Point Wells Subarea Plan Amendment and modification of Map T-18 (Street Classifications) in the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan
- Exhibit 2** Existing Street Classification Map
- Exhibit 3** 2009 City of Shoreline Traffic Flow Map
- Exhibit 4** Table T-14 – General Description of Classified Streets
- Exhibit 5** Minutes from 12/3/09 Planning Commission Public Hearing on the Point Wells Subarea Plan
- Exhibit 6** Minutes from 12/10/09 Planning Commission Public Hearing on the Point Wells Subarea Plan
- Exhibit 7** Notice of Public Hearing
- Exhibit 8** SEPA Checklist, Threshold Determination
- Exhibit 9** 1/27/11 Pre-Application Neighborhood Meeting Notice from BSRE Point Wells, LP
- Exhibit 10** **Comment Letters** included as an attachment to 1/20/11 Public Hearing Staff Report

10.1 Jan O. Bakken

- 10.2 Tom Mailhot
- 10.3 Lin Felton
- 10.4 William Rothman
- 10.5 Ken and Pearl Noreen
- 10.6 Deborah Bowen-Mills
- 10.7 Michael Friedline
- 10.8 Sonja Cassen
- 10.9 Renee Ostrem
- 10.10 Greg McCall
- 10.11 Mark & Sherri Ryan
- 10.12 Michelle Hillyer
- 10.13 Larry Newman
- 10.14 Ginger Botham
- 10.15 Elaine and Robert Phelps
- 10.16 Cathy Martin
- 10.17 Carlton and Lori Findley
- 10.18 Karen Briggs
- 10.19 Ken Anderson
- 10.20 Chris and Sonja Serwold
- 10.21 Heather Bentley



SHORELINE

Geographic Information System

Street Classification

(City of Shoreline
Transportation Master Plan;
with Amendments)

Legend

- Outside Shoreline
- Interstate
- Principal Arterial
- Minor Arterial
- Collector Arterial
- Neighborhood Collector
- Local Street

0 500 1,000 2,000 3,000 Feet

1 inch = 1,919 feet

City of Shoreline
Mark J. Relph, Public Works Director
Rich Meredith, Traffic Engineer
17500 Midvale Ave N
Shoreline, WA 98133
(206) 801-2700
www.shorelinewa.gov

Map Date: 2009
No warranties of any sort, including accuracy, fitness, or merchantability, accompany this product.

μ



This page intentionally blank

City of Shoreline Traffic Flow Map 2009

24-Hour Average Weekday Traffic
(Combined Two-Directional Totals)


Legend

Avg Weekday Traffic Vol:



City of Shoreline
Mark J. Relph, Public Works Director
Rich Meredith, Traffic Engineer
17500 Midvale Ave N
Shoreline, WA 98133
(206) 801-2700
www.shorelinewa.gov

Map Data: Through December 2009
No warranties of any sort, including accuracy, fitness, or merchantability, accompany this product.



This page intentionally blank

Transportation Element – Supporting Analysis

Table T-14: General Description of Classified Streets

	Arterial			Local Street	
	Principal Arterial	Minor Arterial	Collector Arterial	Neighborhood Collector	Local Street
Function	- To connect cities and urban centers with minimum delay - To channel traffic to Interstate system - To accommodate long and through trips	- To connect activity centers within the City - To channel traffic to Principal Arterials/Interstate - Accommodate some long trips	- To serve community centers and businesses - To channel traffic from Neighborhood Access streets to Minor or Principal Arterials - Accommodate medium length trips	- To serve residential areas - To channel traffic from local streets to Collector Arterials - Accommodate short trips such as shopping trips	- To provide local accesses - To serve residential areas
Land Access	- Limited local access – refer to the “Access Management Plan”	- Limited local access to abutting properties	- Local access with some control	- Local access with minimum restrictions	- Local access with minimum restrictions
Speed Limits	- 30 – 45 mph	- 30 – 40 mph	- 30- 35 mph	- 25 –30 mph	- 25 mph
Daily Volumes (vpd)	- More than 15,000 vpd	- 8,000 – 25,000 vpd	- 3,000 – 9,000 vpd	- less than 4,000 vpd	- Less than 4,000 vpd
Number of Lanes	- Three or more lanes	- Three or more lanes	- Two or more lanes	- One or Two lanes	- One or Two lanes
Lane striping	- Travel lanes delineated with stripes	- Travel lanes delineated with stripes	- Travel lanes delineated with stripes	- No travel lane striping	- No travel lane striping
Median	- Landscaped medians or two-way center left turn lanes	- Landscaped medians or two-way center left turn lanes	- Landscaped medians allowed	- Medians are not needed unless provided as traffic calming devices	- Medians may be provided as traffic calming devices
Transit	- Buses/transit stops allowed	- Buses/transit stops allowed	- Buses/transit stops allowed	- Buses/transit stops not generally allowed except for short segments	- Buses/transit stops not allowed
Bicycle Facilities	- Bike lanes or shared lanes desired	- Bike lanes or shared lanes desired	- Bike lanes or shared lanes desired	- Shared lanes can be provided	- Bike facilities not specifically provided; may include signed bike routes
Pedestrian Facilities*	- Sidewalks on both sides - Landscaped/amenity strips	- Sidewalks on both sides - Landscaped/amenity strips	- Sidewalks on both sides - Landscaped/amenity strips	- Sidewalks on both sides - Landscaped/amenity strips	- Safe pedestrian access through the use of sidewalks, trails, or other means.

This page intentionally blank

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Laethan Wene, Shoreline, asked Chair Wagner to share her future plans and direction for the Commission.

LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARING ON POINT WELLS SUBAREA PLAN AND PRE-ANNEXATION ZONING

Chair Wagner referred to the items in the desk packet that were presented to the Commission via email over the past few days that were not part of their original packet. The Commission agreed that a 10-minute recess would be appropriate at some point prior to the public portion of the hearing to review the new items. In addition, it was noted that the Commission would likely postpone action on the two items and continue the hearing and deliberations until December 10, 2009.

Staff Overview and Presentation of Preliminary Staff Recommendation

Mr. Tovar briefly reviewed the following exhibit items that are part of the record:

- **Exhibit 1** – Study Session Memo to Planning Commission, Nov. 5, 2009
- **Exhibit 2** – City Council Resolution 285 – concerning Point Wells
- **Exhibit 3** – Study Session Memo to Planning Commission, Nov. 19, 2009
- **Exhibit 4** – Diagram: The Relationship of State Laws, Plans, Regulations and Permits
- **Exhibit 5** – Public Hearing Staff Report to Planning Commission, Dec. 3, 2009
- **Exhibit 6** – Proposed Point Wells Subarea Plan, Oct. 29, 2009
- **Exhibit 7** – Proposed Pre-Annexation Zoning, Chapter 20.92 – Planned Area 1 Zone, Oct. 29, 2009
- **Exhibit 8** – DRAFT Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for Point Wells, Oct. 29, 2009
- **Exhibit 9** – Point Wells Design Charrette Summary Report, Aug. 22, 2009
- **Exhibit 10** – Snohomish County's Urban Centers Map & PSRC's Regional Centers Map
- **Exhibit 11** – Point Wells Traffic Impact Analysis Model
- **Exhibit 12** – Illustration of 20.90.070 C, Minimum separation of tall buildings
- **Exhibit 13** – Comment Letter: City of Edmonds, Bertrand Hauss, Nov. 23, 2009
- **Exhibit 14** – Comment Letter: Shoreline Resident, Donald Ding, Nov. 25, 2009
- **Exhibit 15** – Comment Letter: Snohomish County, Larry Adamson, Nov. 23, 2009
- **Exhibit 16** – Comment Letter: Shoreline Resident, Michael Strand, Nov. 27, 2009
- **Exhibit 17** – Comment Letter: Snohomish County, Larry Adamson, Dec. 2, 2009
- **Exhibit 18** – Staff Response: City of Shoreline Memo, Steve Cohn, Dec. 2, 2009
- **Exhibit 19** – Comment Letter: Town of Woodway, Carla Nichols, Dec. 3, 2009
- **Exhibit 20** – Public Hearing Staff Report to Planning Commission, Apr. 16, 2009

Mr. Tovar emphasized that the draft documents currently before the Commission for review are significantly different than what was presented in April of 2009. He reminded the Commission that when they reviewed the proposal in April, the pre-annexation zoning proposal did not accompany the subarea plan. He clarified that all documents received to date regarding the proposal have been entered into the record and made available to the Commission in either hard copy or via email.

Mr. Cohn added two more exhibits to the record:

- **Exhibit 21** – Comment letter from the Save Richmond Beach Organization dated December 3, 2009.
- **Exhibit 22** – Comment letter from Gary D. Huff, Karr Tuttle Campbell, dated December 3, 2009.

Mr. Tovar advised that the final SEIS would be available to the Commission and public and would consist of all comments that have been received to date. He informed the Commission that Rich Meredith, Traffic Engineer, was present to answer the Commission's additional questions regarding traffic.

Mr. Tovar referred to the comment letter from Larry Adamson, Acting Snohomish County Planning Director, which asserts that the City's proposed subarea plan does not include any consideration of potential annexation issues that would arise if the City were to attempt to annex the Point Wells area. The letter notes that the Town of Woodway has a much larger shared boundary with the Point Wells lowland area compared to the City of Shoreline's shared boundary. It states that since only a very small portion of unincorporated Point Wells is contiguous to Shoreline's City limits, any proposal by Shoreline to annex the area is likely to be considered a "shoe-string" annexation with extremely irregular boundaries. Mr. Tovar said he would agree with Mr. Adamson's comments if all that is considered is the linear feet of adjacency of the two jurisdictions. However, the most significant number is the percentage of the traffic that would come through the City of Shoreline, which is 100%.

Mr. Tovar also referred to the comment letter from Carla Nichols, Mayor of the Town of Woodway, which expresses concern about the proposed design review process. He explained that staff's intent was to use the same administrative review process that was recently approved as part of the new Mixed Use (MU) zone. However, he acknowledged there are other options for design review such as a public hearing by the Hearing Examiner with a recommendation to the City Council, a public hearing by the Hearing Examiner with an appeal to the City Council, a public hearing by the Hearing Examiner with an appeal to Superior Court, and a public hearing by the Planning Commission with an appeal to the City council.

Commissioner Broili suggested that the Commission should keep in mind Mr. Tovar's point that the only present and future reasonable access and impacts are through the City of Shoreline. Other than the border, Snohomish County has no connection to the area. He expressed his belief that Mr. Adamson's opinion about the linear property line would not hold up in court.

The Commission took a 10-minute break at 7:25 p.m. to review the additional exhibits. They reconvened the meeting at 7:35 p.m.

Mr. Tovar clarified that the hearing is a concurrent hearing on an amendment to the City's Comprehensive Plan to adopt a Point Wells Subarea Plan and Pre-Annexation zoning for the Point Wells area. The public would be invited to comment on both items. He explained that the proposed Point Wells Subarea Plan outlines the things that are important to the City and what they want the outcome to be. The Pre-Annexation Zoning Regulations will provide more specificity to implement the plan. He suggested the Commission keep the public hearing on both items open until they are confident that the proposed regulations are consistent and implement the plan they want to recommend for approval.

Mr. Tovar noted the item has been scheduled on the City Council's agenda for January 21, 2010. If the Commission needs more time after the December 10th meeting to make a recommendation, the item could be carried over to the Commission's January 7th meeting, but he cautioned it would be in the City's best interest for them to conclude the hearing and make a recommendation on December 10th.

Mr. Tovar advised that Mr. Huff's (Karr Tuttle Campbell) comment letter requests the Commission slow down the process. He encouraged the Commission to invite representatives of the property owner, Paramount, to comment on this request. He reminded the Commission that Snohomish County is currently dealing with their own regulatory regime for the Point Wells property, and a public hearing has been scheduled for December 9th. He suggested it would be premature for the Commission to decide to slow down the City's process until they have some notion of whether or not Snohomish County would slow down their process, as well. Staff will have more information about this subject at the Commission's December 10th meeting.

Mr. Tovar said that when the City Council receives both pieces of the Planning Commission's recommendation, they could adopt the Commission's recommendation as put forth. They also have the option of making changes to the Commission's recommendation, but only if the changes were discussed as part of the record. If they want to consider something that is different than what the Commission recommends and is outside of the established record, they could remand the issue back to the Commission for further hearing and deliberation.

Chair Wagner said that, typically, the Commission places a motion on the table and then they deliberate and make changes to the motion before finalizing their recommendation. However, this process will be different in that a motion will not be on the table prior to Commission deliberation.

Questions by Commission to Staff

There were no Commission questions during this portion of the hearing.

Public Testimony

Chair Wagner reviewed the rules and procedures for the public portion of the hearing and then opened the floor for public testimony.

Caycee Holt, Shoreline, said she was present to represent the group, Save Richmond Beach, which is a community-driven, volunteer-managed, non-profit organization dedicated to preserving the Richmond Beach Community through thoughtful, responsible and sustainable planning. Their members come from not only Richmond Beach, but all neighborhoods of Shoreline, in addition to the Town of Woodway and Edmonds. She recalled that the proposed Pre-Annexation Zoning notes that Richmond Beach Road and Richmond Beach Drive in Shoreline would be the only access to the Point Wells site, and this fact became abundantly clear a few weeks ago when a single-car accident (by the library) closed down the road for the entire day. The group feels the zoning document and traffic analysis do not adequately address the issue of access to the site and the public safety of the Richmond Beach residents. She emphasized there is just one way in and out of the neighborhood.

Ms. Holt also expressed the group's belief that the traffic impact and mitigation plans are too vague to assess how the increased traffic would be addressed. The group agrees that a corridor study is a necessity because the traffic and safety analysis was sorely lacking in several areas including public safety, cut-through traffic, and potential mitigation. She said she heard from several members who are extremely concerned about cut-through traffic because many roads link to Richmond Beach Drive, and people will avoid traffic by using the very narrow cut-through streets.

Ms. Holt said the group supports Shoreline's effort to limit vehicular traffic to and from the site, but this alone will not adequately address the serious access and traffic issues associated with development at the Point Wells site. Without a reliable corridor study, it will be impossible to gauge what the traffic numbers will really mean on the ground. The City's own traffic study suggests that the road system would break down at that level of additional traffic. She suggested the vehicle trip limit should also take into account that any development at Point Wells would generate additional development along the corridor, which would result in even more traffic to Richmond Beach.

Ms. Holt pointed out that the estimated vehicle trips would only be as accurate as the studies or models underlying the estimate. The group suggests the City establish the industry-accepted guidelines and standards for measuring the traffic impacts. She said the group is concerned that it would be difficult to enforce such a limit. For example, what would happen if the development is overbuilt? Would they be required to tear down buildings if they exceed the allowed number of vehicle trips per day. She reminded the Commission that the City of Shoreline has standards for public safety, including details such as sidewalks on both sides of the street. The group feels that public safety of the current residents should be the City's top priority. An annexation bid from a developer should not change the City's standards. She noted she has not seen anything that would require access to mass transit at the Point Wells site, and this intense type of development may require access demand mass transit.

Ms. Holt said the group believes there should be land use standards that limit the potential uses at the Point Wells site. Because of the remote location and lack of access to mass transit, the use of the site will be an important factor in curbing excessive car trips and insuring public safety. The group believes the land uses should also be compatible with the surrounding single-family residential neighborhoods. In conclusion, Ms. Holt said the group urges the Planning Commission to encourage a more thorough evaluation of the impacts on the current citizens of Shoreline and Richmond Beach before promising

Paramount Northwest a pre-annexation zoning package that would imperil the residents of Shoreline and Richmond Beach.

Donald Ding, Shoreline, expressed concern about the development of the Point Wells property either as part of Snohomish County or Shoreline. He said the City should not sacrifice their neighborhoods to excessive traffic growth and a stretch on services just for the sake of unneeded growth. He recalled that the City was recognized by *SEATTLE MAGAZINE* as the best community a few years ago, and as the second best in 2009. He urged the Commission to keep and protect the good things that exist in Shoreline.

Mr. Ding said he has significant concerns about the information presented in the traffic report and the draft SEIS. He questioned if an accurate description has been portrayed concerning impacts, mitigations and conditions for development. He said he also submitted written comments to the City, of which the Commission has copies. He questioned if the City really needs the growth at Point Wells. He advised that the City's Comprehensive Plan requires them to accommodate a level of growth, which they have already done. The extra increment of growth that would be accommodated by the Point Wells site seems to be excessive and unneeded. He pointed out that the boundaries of the traffic analysis are drawn too tightly. He reminded the Commission that the City will be spending over \$100 million of local, state and federal funds for the Aurora Corridor Project. He questioned if the City wants to marginalize this project before it is even finished by allowing additional traffic to impact Aurora Avenue North at 185th and 175th, as well as the Interstate 5 interchanges.

Mr. Ding said he believes transit and rail service at Point Wells are not likely. No discounting of trips should be allowed unless the proposal pays its own way for services and facilities and certainty of use by residents is guaranteed and sustained. He noted that neither Metro, Community Transit or Sound Transit have plans to provide service to this area. There is also no guarantee that residents would use the service anyway. Because of the inadequacy of the current analysis, Mr. Ding asked that the Commission require an updated traffic study to get a true read of impacts and mitigation. He asked them to do the right thing to protect and save the neighborhoods. Only accept growth if it is needed, mitigated and at the right scale. He wants the City to stay on the "Best of Seattle" list.

Commissioner Behrens said that in reading through the responses, there appears to be some dispute about the impacts the development would cause on the east side of Aurora Avenue North and the freeway interchanges. He asked Mr. Ding to provide his thoughts and the basis for his conclusions in writing. Mr. Ding once again expressed concern that the traffic analysis stops at the intersection of 185th and Aurora Avenue North, which is a commercial site but not a regional destination. Trips will not stop at this location; they will go to other destinations. He recalled the Snohomish County study indicates that only 13% of the trips originating from the Point Wells site would reach 185th and Aurora Avenue North. If the remaining 85% of the traffic would filter through the neighborhoods, there should be some discussion about assessing and mitigating the impacts. While the City countered that only 40% of the trips would divert, this amount would still have an impact on the character of the neighborhoods.

Mr. Ding pointed out that the table contained in the draft SEIS contains numbers that are inconsistent with the Institute of Transportation Engineer's Manual. He suggested the real threshold will be 825 trips

during the peak hour. He summarized that it is erroneous to include inaccurate numbers in the table because they can lead the Commission into making inaccurate assumptions in the future.

Commissioner Behrens again asked Mr. Ding to submit his ideas and comments in writing for the Commission's consideration. Chair Piro agreed it would be helpful for Mr. Ding to provide written testimony to support his request that the traffic study boundaries be expanded to include Interstate 5 and SR-104. Mr. Ding responded that if these other areas would not be significantly impacted, then the traffic study should identify where the traffic would go. Chair Wagner suggested the Commission allow the City's Traffic Engineer to comment regarding Mr. Ding's concerns, as well.

Commissioner Piro recalled Mr. Ding's written recommendation that the Commission should consider opportunities to include non-motorized, bicycle and pedestrian features into whatever happens with the connections between Point Wells and Aurora Avenue North and beyond. He suggested Mr. Ding provide his thoughts on the viability of pedestrian non-motorized travel and transit on the Point Wells site, which is so isolated from the rest of the transportation network.

Robin McClelland, Shoreline, said that she did the first Comprehensive Plan for the Town of Woodway in 1994, and she has been interested in the Point Wells site ever since. She expressed her belief that issues related to transportation are significant. She referred to Page 33 of the Staff Report, and suggested the statement that Richmond Beach Road and Richmond Beach Drive provide the only vehicular access is not true or fair because it is possible for traffic to divert. She summarized that it is important that the City not lead the public to think that there are only two access options for Point Wells.

Ms. McClelland suggested that rather than only thinking about the negative impacts of the proposal, she suggested the City turn their thinking around and consider opportunities to create a destination for residents of Shoreline. The City should seek every type of mitigation possible to provide facilities and amenities that benefit the City economically, recreationally, and socially. They should not limit themselves only to the issue of transportation, even though it is a major concern.

Jack Malek, Shoreline, concurred with Ms. McClelland's comment about the need to benefit from development of Point Wells to make it a destination point that will benefit the community in general. He also agreed with concerns stated earlier about transportation. He said he would prefer annexation into the City of Shoreline.

Mr. Malek said he was also present to speak for his friend, Scott Becker, regarding the proposed subarea plan, which calls for three sectors. He pointed out that the line distinguishing the Northwest and Southwest Sectors does not reflect a clear geographic distinction. He also feels the park location should be based more on an overall master plan. He questioned why a distinction was made in Policy PW-4 that limits the height in the Southeast Sector to no more than six stories. He referenced Policy PW-5 and suggested the "slender tower" regulation would make more sense as a general design review guideline document. He asked how the view corridor concept in Policy PW-6 would be implemented. He also suggests that permitting by administrative design review and site development does not seem adequate relative to the scale of the site.

Mr. Tovar referred to Ms. McClelland's comments regarding access to the Point Wells site. He said staff's point was that you must go through Shoreline to access Point Wells. There is no direct route through Edmonds, Woodway or unincorporated Snohomish County. However, he agreed that after coming some distance into Shoreline, a person could fork off into a number of diversions, most of which are also in Shoreline before reaching Edmonds and/or Woodway.

Mr. Tovar noted the Commission may want to craft changes to the proposed Point Wells Subarea Plan and Pre-Annexation Zoning. However, rather than trying to compose specific language at this time, he suggested the Commission identify the concepts they are after and ask staff to bring back implementing language to the December 10th meeting.

Mr. Tovar recalled the comment about the proposed 35-foot building height limit in the Northwest and Southwest Sectors within the view corridor. He recalled that the Commission previously discussed moving the line to correspond to the view corridor since the building height limit in the Southwest Sector is 35-feet anyway. He said the Commission could request a revised drawing from staff.

Chair Wagner observed that because citizens have already been invited to provide testimony, it would be appropriate to only invite additional oral public testimony on items that are new. However, she encouraged the public to continue to submit their written comments. Mr. Tovar said the amended language would be available on the City's website by the close of business on December 8th.

Final Questions by the Commission

Commissioner Piro asked staff to respond to Mr. Strand's comment letter, which expressed opposition to the Commission moving forward with a subarea plan and zoning for Point Wells. Mr. Strand's letter suggests the City force Snohomish County to provide access and service to the site and keep it separate from Shoreline. Mr. Tovar said that if this option were possible, it would have been high on the staff's list of recommendations. The Town of Woodway has been clear that they would not approve the creation of right-of-way through Woodway to connect the bluff area to the lowland area. In addition, most of the area is considered sensitive slope, and environmental regulations in Snohomish County and the Town of Woodway would not permit encroachment into the slope to build a road. While it would likely be possible from an engineering standpoint, it would be extremely costly. Others have suggested punching a road to the north along the tracks, but the right-of-way disappears into open water at points on both sides of the tracks. Therefore, this approach would raise serious environmental issues that would involve state agencies, tribes, federal government, etc. While it could be done with enough money, the environmental regulations make it unlikely. Another suggestion was to simply close the road, but the City Attorney has indicated the City cannot legally close the road if it is the only public access to the property. That doesn't mean the property owner has the right to an unlimited number of vehicles trips per day. The City's study identifies a logical break point for how many vehicle trips would be acceptable, but the Commission could offer a different number.

Commissioner Piro said that while the City cannot legally close the road, they could incorporate traffic calming features, etc. Mr. Tovar agreed and noted there are numerous engineering improvement

methods for dealing with cut-through traffic and for slowing down the traffic. These details will be considered as part of the subsequent corridor study that is funded by the developer.

Commissioner Piro requested clarification as to why the property owner's representative is asking the Commission to slow the process down. Mr. Tovar said he believes the property owner is hoping to assemble a design team in the near future to obtain a clear sense of what they think would work for the property. Once preliminary plans are completed, the property owner would share thoughts on what the appropriate regulations should be regardless of whether the property is located in Shoreline, Woodway, or Snohomish County.

Commissioner Piro asked if there would be an opportunity for future modifications to the subarea plan and pre-annexation zoning language through the regular amendment process. Mr. Tovar said that once a subarea plan and pre-annexation zoning is adopted by the City Council, the only way to change the language would be via the regular amendment process. Another option would be for the Commission to finish their deliberations and make a recommendation to the City Council, and then let the City Council decide how rapidly they wanted to move on the proposal.

Commissioner Piro requested staff elaborate on the concerns raised in the letter from the Mayor of the Town of Woodway about the proposed view corridors and height limits. Mr. Tovar said staff has known for some time that building height and views are an issue in Woodway, and he has attended two of their Town Council Meetings to discuss their concerns. He shared the Sketch Up computer model and the drawings that show the different building heights and masses from various vantage points, two of which were taken from locations in Woodway and were intended to illustrate the potential impacts. The Town of Woodway has expressed a desire for more computer models and drawings, and staff indicated they could obtain a copy of the file and retain a consultant to help them generate more analysis from different vantage points in Woodway, but the City of Shoreline does not have the resources or obligation to model numerous vantage points from the Town of Woodway.

Mr. Tovar said another option to address the issue of appropriate building mass and height within view corridors would be to write the regulations in such a way that the City would be allowed to reserve judgment until the permit review. Staff's approach was to identify view corridors the City is concerned about and write regulations that keep the building mass out of the corridors. Commissioner Piro said he is inclined to recommend the City consider this issue further with the Town of Woodway at the time of permitting. Commissioner Piro noted that the proposed language uses the terms "view corridor" and "public view corridor," and he suggested the same term should be used throughout.

Commissioner Broili pointed out that it would be conceivably possible to create a major corridor out of the City of Shoreline from Point Wells to the first access into Woodway. All of the traffic from Point Wells could be directed to this route instead of Richmond Beach Road and 185th. Mr. Tovar agreed this would be possible if there was adequate funding and the City was willing to condemn properties. Commissioner Broili said that although he is not saying this alternative would be practical, it would be a fairly short route to get the traffic out of Shoreline into Woodway. Mr. Tovar concurred. Commissioner Broili urged the Commission to think as long-range as possible in terms of transportation planning and the way they think about the future.

Commissioner Broili referred to Page 17 of the November 19th minutes in which Mr. Meredith explained that it is difficult to get funding to add lanes and capacity to roadways since most of the funding goes to multi-modal projects. Mr. Broili suggested the overall strategy for transportation studies should focus on creating multi-modal transportation opportunities in the future. He expressed concern that the City is not thinking long-range enough about traffic flows and how to take advantage of them. He expressed his opinion that neither the City of Shoreline nor Snohomish County is being realistic in terms of the real traffic impacts over the next five to ten years if Point Wells is built out to its potential. He encouraged the Commission to think more long-range and comprehensive and focus on multi-modal opportunities.

Commissioner Broili pointed out that topography defines the Point Wells area, and topography also drives transportation. There is only one realistic way in and out of the site, and Richmond Beach Road to 185th will continue to grow. He agreed with the previous speaker who pointed out that development of the Point Wells site would encourage more growth, which would create even more traffic. He also recalled the previous comment about making the Point Wells site a destination area. All of these issues spell out the need for more long-range planning.

Commissioner Pyle referred to the letter from Gary Huff, which states that if the City of Shoreline does not slow down its process and consider the agreement that Paramount Northwest is trying to achieve with the Town of Woodway, the County and the City of Shoreline, they will choose to annex to the County. Mr. Tovar said the property is already within the jurisdiction of Snohomish County, and they could proceed with redevelopment under Snohomish County's new urban center code. He explained that a property owner can file a petition to annex to the City, but this petition would be subject to the Boundary Review Board statutes. The Boundary Review Board's final decision could be appealed to Superior Court and then to the Court of Appeals and the Supreme Court. At the very least, the property owner would have to initiate the annexation process.

Commissioner Pyle summarized that unless the property owner chooses to be annexed into the City of Shoreline, the subarea plan and pre-annexation zoning language would not be fruitful. Mr. Tovar disagreed. He explained that the purpose of this process is to articulate what the City thinks should happen on the property. Even if the Point Wells site is never annexed into the City of Shoreline, the adopted plan and regulations will help shape what is ultimately adopted by Snohomish County. Commissioner Pyle asked if the City has the ability to appeal Snohomish County's Urban Center designation. Mr. Tovar answered that the City of Shoreline, Town of Woodway and City of Richmond Beach have all filed appeals to the County's designation for Point Wells. There is currently a request for an extension to pursue settlement of the case.

Commissioner Broili asked if the City could apply for an annexation without the property owner's support. Mr. Tovar answered that annexation to Shoreline would require the property owner's support. Commissioner Broili pointed out that if the City's desire is to eventually annex the Point Wells property, they should avoid making it so difficult that the developer decides it is easier to stay under the County's jurisdiction. Mr. Tovar cautioned that the City's objective should not be to make their regulations and policies so compelling that the property owner cannot refuse. However, he agreed that more stringent policies would make it more difficult to convince the property owner to go through the annexation process. He encouraged the Commission to focus on what they think is the right use for the property and

why. He summarized his belief that it makes more sense for the property to be developed under Shoreline's jurisdiction.

Commissioner Behrens observed that if the City of Shoreline has input on how the development goes forward, they can attempt to mitigate some of the more obvious problems. Chair Wagner reminded the Commission that there is not currently a development proposal before them. While it is appropriate to talk about potential development in terms of its impacts to the City, she cautioned against making value judgments regarding a particular proposal at this time.

Mr. Tovar emphasized that Snohomish County has not adopted final zoning language for the Point Wells site. He noted that proposed Policy PW-10 states that "the City should work with the Town of Woodway and Snohomish County towards the adoption of interlocal agreements to address the issues of land use, construction management of, urban service delivery to, and local governance of Point Wells."

Commissioner Broili asked if Snohomish County is reluctant to lose control of the Point Wells property because it represents a lost opportunity for them to meet their urban growth boundary requirements. Mr. Tovar said one of their letters touches on the point that they made an urban growth allocation for the Point Wells site. However, if the property is annexed into Shoreline, an interlocal agreement could clarify this issue and give the urban growth credit to Snohomish County. Commissioner Broili noted that the County would also lose tax revenue if the property were annexed into the City of Shoreline. Mr. Tovar agreed that a number of taxes would come into play, and they could be addressed as part of an interlocal agreement, as well.

Chair Wagner pointed out that some of the tax revenue would need to flow to Shoreline to pay for the necessary services to the site. Mr. Tovar reminded the Commission that the Shoreline Police and Fire Departments and the King County Sheriff's Department have taken the position that they will not provide services to an unincorporated urban center in Snohomish County. If that is the case, the services would have to be provided by some other entity, which is theoretically possible but not an efficient delivery of urban services. Again, Mr. Tovar emphasized that these concerns could be addressed via an interlocal agreement between Snohomish County, the City of Shoreline and the Town of Woodway.

Vice Chair Perkowski asked staff to address the pros and cons of why they need an adopted subarea plan now, given the uncertainties and valid concerns that have been raised about transportation and long-range issues. Mr. Tovar recalled that the City Council has asked the Planning Commission to forward a recommendation to them regarding a subarea plan and pre-annexation zoning for Point Wells as soon as possible. In addition, it is important to keep in mind that Snohomish County has already adopted a Comprehensive Plan amendment for Point Wells, which has been appealed. The County has also held zoning hearings, and they could adopt new regulations for Point Wells at any time. Unless there is an adopted policy statement of the City Council, staff must rely on their sense of Council's intent and Resolution 285 when working with Snohomish County, the Town of Woodway and the property owner. Vice Chair Perkowski asked if an adopted plan is necessary or if the current policy statements could be revised. Mr. Tovar said the discussion is complicated, and an adopted plan would be helpful in the staff's future discussions with the County.

Commissioner Pyle observed that while it is great for the City to inform Snohomish County on their process and to continue to study what could be built there, going so far as to adopt a subarea plan could ultimately put the City's ability to actually annex the property in jeopardy. Mr. Tovar agreed that is a possibility. However, it is important to keep in mind there are many different players, interests and redevelopment options to consider for the site. He recommended the Commission move forward with a recommendation to the City Council. The City Council could ultimately decide to adopt a few main points of the recommendation by resolution rather than as an entire subarea plan if they believe that adopting a subarea plan would have a negative outcome. He said staff would continue to meet with the property owner, Snohomish County, and others, to discuss what it would take to move forward with a shared vision for the site.

Commissioner Broili asked if the property owner is looking for an agreement that the City will work with them to come up with a proposal that meets the requirements of both the City and the property owner. Mr. Tovar answered that the property owner is looking for some assurance of timing, details, etc. Commissioner Broili recommended it would not be to the City's best interest to adopt a plan at this point. The City already has a policy statement that indicates the direction they are interested in going. He cautioned that they need an agreement that gives both the property owner and the City the opportunity to move forward, but they should avoid "slamming the door" on future options by creating regulations that are too specific at this time. Mr. Tovar agreed that if the County were to slow down its process, it would also make sense for the City to slow down their process as well.

Mr. Tovar reminded the Commission that their charge, per Resolution 285, is to make recommendations to the City Council on what the plan should include and what the zoning should look like. The City Council did not ask them to advise them on whether or not they should postpone adoption of the plan. He urged the Commission to make their recommendation and leave it to the Council to decide how they want to address Mr. Huff's request to slow down the process.

Commissioner Piro agreed with Mr. Tovar that whether or not the property is annexed into Shoreline in the future, an adopted subarea plan and pre-annexation zoning could be used as a tool to enter into conversation and dialogue with other partners that are interested in the property. The proposal addresses issues related to bulk, view and traffic, which will give the City a strong hand in future discussions. He cautioned the Commission to not lose sight that there is more at play than just what happens at Point Wells. For example, Policy PW-7 would require the developer to undertake a transportation corridor study involving property that is currently located within the City of Shoreline.

Discussion

Commissioner Piro said both the Commission and the public have questioned if the requirements of the corridor study goes far enough to address issues such as multi-modal transportation. He suggested the developer could be required to complete a corridor plan rather than a corridor study. Mr. Tovar clarified that the product of the corridor study would include action steps, projects, cost estimates, funding sources, etc. He suggested staff rework Policy PW-7 to clarify that an implementation plan would also be required. He suggested the language could also be amended if the Commission feels strongly that the study area should be extended to SR-104 and Interstate 5. Several Commissioners agreed that would be

appropriate. Again, Commissioner Piro pointed out that the required corridor plan would offer a mechanism for the City to have some ownership on what happens with Richmond Beach Road or other potential access routes into Woodway. He suggested it would ease the concerns of the Richmond Beach Neighborhood if they could provide a specific plan for related roadways rather than just an ambiguous plan that would accommodate more vehicles.

Commissioner Behrens encouraged staff to involve representatives from the Richmond Beach Community in the transportation corridor study. Some tough decisions will have to be made by those who live in the area, and the City can gain from the guidance they offer. Mr. Tovar suggested that a citizen's advisory group could be formed to engage the public and find out what they know. He suggested staff could draft some language that would dictate this type of group as one of the components of the transportation corridor study and implementation program. He agreed that Policy PW-8 could be amended to require both schematic designs and cost estimates. Chair Wagner suggested that because the entire City could potentially benefit from redevelopment at Point Wells, the citizen's advisory group should include other interested parties in addition to residents of the Richmond Beach Neighborhood.

Commissioner Kuboi cautioned against reviewing the proposed subarea plan and pre-annexation zoning based on what may or may not be proposed by the current property owner. He noted that it is possible the site could be developed by multiple developers. Mr. Tovar said that if the Commission believes the whole site should be developed comprehensively under single ownership, the regulation should make this clear. While the City could not prohibit a property owner from platting the property and selling it to different developers, the zoning language could be structured to point out why that would not be desirable. He noted that all the densities and uses discussed have contemplated a single master plan for the property. If they are going to contemplate dividing the property into smaller pieces, perhaps the zoning should not so permissive and allow so much to happen. He said he would like an opportunity to phrase language to this affect for the Commission to consider at their next meeting.

Commissioner Broili said he would like the language to take into account a much longer range vision than what has been considered when coming up with the number of vehicle trips that would be allowed. Secondly, he said he would like the language to be amended to extend the transportation corridor study to Interstate 5 and 205th. The remainder of the Commission concurred.

Mr. Meredith explained that the traffic study assumes that 60% of the estimated 825 p.m. peak vehicle trips would make it to Aurora Avenue North. These vehicles would go both north and south on Aurora Avenue North, and some would disperse onto other streets. By the time they reach 205th, there may be no more than 200 p.m. peak vehicle trips. A number of cars would continue north on Aurora Avenue at 205th, and some would go towards Interstate 5, which could reduce the number of cars onto SR-104 to just 100. He noted there are currently about 45,000 cars per day on SR-104. He summarized that by the time you get that far away from Point Wells, there would not be a significant impact on SR-104. The same would be true for Interstate 5 so extending the boundaries would result in diminishing returns. He summarized that with so many routes people can choose to take, there is no way to have confidence that the predictions would be correct. The analysis actually loses meaning the further away you get from the development, and that is why he did not recommend the study area be continued to Interstate 5 and SR-

104. While they could extend the study, he questioned how much value it would provide. However, he agreed there would be value in extending the study area from 185th to Meridian.

Commissioner Piro said he is surprised that the study indicates that only 60% of the traffic from Point Wells would make it to Aurora Avenue North and 185th. He questioned where the other 40% of traffic would go. Mr. Meredith said he actually identified 60% to 65% making it to Aurora. He explained that the study assumes that a small percentage of traffic would turn off at the intersecting arterials along Richmond Beach Road. Commissioner Piro noted that a percentage of the vehicles that turn off of Richmond Beach Road would actually end up at 175th and Interstate 5 or 205th. Mr. Meredith agreed and said that is why the model starts to break down as cars travel further and further away from Point Wells.

Commissioner Piro said he still believes that extending the study boundaries to Interstate 5 and 205th would have some value, even if the impact becomes much less significant. The additional traffic should be considered cumulative with development that might occur elsewhere in the City. Mr. Meredith agreed that it is important to consider cumulative traffic impacts, and that is why the proposed language would require a more detailed traffic analysis. He noted the staff's traffic analysis only looked at the p.m. peak, and a more detailed analysis would consider both morning and evening traffic impacts.

Commissioner Behrens said he lives on Meridian Avenue, so he has firsthand knowledge of what happens when traffic diffuses through a neighborhood. When you reach a certain point, vehicles tend to leave arterials and go to side streets. However, they will eventually accumulate at major locations. Drivers will make decisions based on impediments that are on the road in front of them. Mr. Meredith said the City's goal is to encourage vehicles to stay on the arterials and off of local streets. There are options for accomplishing this goal, but they must be balanced with the need for people who live in the neighborhood to reach their destinations without too much delay.

Commissioner Broili referred to Mr. Meredith's previous statement about the uncertainties and disparity in the traffic study numbers and noted that it is the tendency for municipalities to underestimate the impacts associated with development. He encouraged the Commission and staff to be as conservative and long-range as possible in their analysis in order to save the City money and reduce impacts.

The Commission agreed that Policy PW-7 should be amended by adding language that would encourage and highlight the importance of multi-modal transportation. Commissioner Piro observed that in addition to addressing bicycle and pedestrian safety, the transportation corridor study should explore opportunities for pedestrian and bicycle mobility. The remainder of the Commission concurred.

Commissioner Broili referred to Policy PW-9 and encouraged the Commission to be very conservative in the way they think about the impacts. Chair Wagner recalled a question she raised at the study session about why the traffic study focused on the number of trips versus level of service. Perhaps they could establish a threshold that no more than one intersection can reach Level of Service F at evening peak traffic. Commissioner Piro said he would like the language to require mitigation that would transfer 825 vehicle trips that currently happen in the Richmond Beach area into other modes of transportation so there would be no net increase in vehicle trips. He expressed skepticism about the way the City has handled level of service in the past, and he would be in favor of a more multi-modal approach.

Mr. Meredith said it is important to maintain the level of service measurement in the proposed language since that is the approach used in the transportation master plan update in relation to concurrency. Staff tried to take it a step further to see how the size of the development would affect the level of service. He referred to Chair Wagner's suggestions and said he does not think the City wants to allow an intersection to fail. Mr. Tovar summarized that there was a lot of focus on how many units per acre should be allowed. Even if they had landed on a number of units allowed rather than a number vehicle trips, the proposal would have been susceptible to the same concern. He suggested there is no more predictability or precision under either method. The basis of the proposed language is that the City cares less about what is developed on the property and more about impacts on the City's street system.

Commissioner Behrens asked if it would be possible to collect a percentage of the sales taxes that are generated by Point Wells into a capital improvement fund that could be managed via an interlocal agreement with Woodway, Edmonds, etc. If the traffic impacts turn out to be overwhelming or very understated, the City would have available funding to correct the problems. Mr. Tovar agreed this would be possible. Rather than requiring additional mitigation from the developer, a portion of the additional revenue stream would be dedicated to dealing with the unanticipated impacts. Another option would be to review the transportation demand management program that is already required and ratchet up the requirements to deal with some of the excess impacts. For example, carpooling, van pooling, bus passes, etc. are all options to obligate a developer to do more to deal with unanticipated additional impacts. He cautioned against creating an accounting system that involves the capital budgets of two or three jurisdictions since it would not generate any additional resources than what is already coming from the site. Mr. Tovar agreed to pursue options for addressing how the City would respond if, at some point in the future, there are unanticipated impacts that need to be mitigated.

Commissioner Broili pointed out that solar power, rainwater harvesting, etc. are on the cusp of becoming the way to go in new development. Many builders are designing their projects to accommodate these options in the future. Changes and modifications along the Richmond Beach/185th Corridor should be designed with the future in mind. If the City requires a developer to design for 20 or 30 years into the future, the costs for upgrades are going to be much less than if they only design for five years down the road and have to tear it out and start over again. While long-range thinking may cost more upfront, it will save a lot of money in the future. The language in the plan, the pre-annexation zoning, and any interlocal agreements should think further out into the future.

Commissioner Kuboi said it is one thing to require a property owner to put utilities in certain locations so they do not have to be moved when changes occur in the future because the requirement would not place an additional burden on the applicant. However, he would be opposed to requiring a developer to provide extra capacity to meet the demand 20 years into the future. He would support language that requires a developer to mitigate the actual impacts that are created, but requiring them to mitigate for projected future impacts would be inappropriate. Commissioner Broili disagreed. He observed that while there would be immediate impacts associated with the redevelopment of Point Wells, there would also be other impacts associated with future growth that takes place as a result of the development. Commissioner Kuboi cautioned against burdening a developer to the point that they don't want to do business in Shoreline.

Chair Wagner suggested that perhaps this issue could be addressed at the policy level and the City could assist in mitigating the future impacts rather than placing all the burden on the developer. Mr. Tovar said the proposal could include aspirational policy language that states Commissioner Broili's philosophy, but it is more difficult to identify what the City can commit a developer to do 30 years from now that has both the nexus and proportionality required by law. Commissioner Broili said he is not implying that the developer should carry the burden of mitigating impacts into the future, but the City has the responsibility to do so. When staff has discussions with the developer at the permitting stage, they can identify what the City expects to happen and what burden the developer must carry. The City could also carry some of the burden of providing the services. There must be a balance between the City, the developer and long-range thinking. Commissioner Piro suggested that Commissioner Broili's concerns could be addressed in the narrative in the Interjurisdictional Coordination Section and potential amendments to Policy PW-10.

Commissioner Behrens asked where the transportation corridor study would end on Aurora Avenue North. Commissioner Piro recalled staff's earlier statement that the City's concern is not so much what happens on Interstate 5, but just the City streets. Therefore, he suggested they focus on the intersection at 175th.

Mr. Cohn encouraged the Commissioners to submit their additional comments by noon on December 7th. Mr. Tovar said staff would incorporate all of the Commission's comments into a new draft for consideration at their December 10th meeting. The updated draft would be available for Commission review on December 8th. He referred to questions raised earlier by the Commission, which could equate into amendments to the proposals. For example, the Commission discussed the possibility of amending the proposal to change the line between the Northwest and Southwest Sectors. In addition, Commissioner Perkowski suggested the restoration plan language be changed to be less prescriptive and more aspirational.

Vice Chair Perkowski observed that the future vision for Point Wells contains language related to sustainability, yet none of the policy statements address the issue. He questioned if each of the policy statements are intended to cover the text. Mr. Tovar said all of the language in the proposed subarea plan is considered policy, and the ten policy statements are intended to be concise and call attention to some specific action or concept. Vice Chair Perkowski expressed concern that someone could interpret the policy statements to be more important than the text because they are highlighted. Mr. Tovar asked the Commissioners to identify parts of the narrative that should be captured with additional policy statements.

COMMISSIONER PYLE MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION CONTINUE THE PUBLIC HEARING TO DECEMBER 10, 2009. COMMISSIONER PIRO SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Tovar did not have any items to report to the Commission during this portion of the meeting.

This page intentionally blank

DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS

Mr. Tovar announced that this is the last night that any City meeting would be held in the Shoreline Conference Center. The Commission's first meeting in January would be held in the Council Chambers of the new City Hall.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of December 3, 2009 were approved as presented.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Steve Ohlenkamp, Kenmore, indicated he was present to represent Paramount Petroleum. He announced that the Snohomish County Council decided not to act on their urban centers legislation. Instead, they have scheduled it for action on February 3rd at the earliest. He asked that the Commission consider delaying action on the City's Point Wells Subarea Plan proposal, as well. He pointed out that Paramount Petroleum has started to work with an architect to determine what might be possible on the site, and a lot of work will take place over the next few months. He noted that Paramount Petroleum is not in a hurry, and they don't understand how important decisions such as zoning can be made without sitting down with the developer to see if what is being proposed would even be viable. He noted that they are just beginning the design of their project, and they don't have answers yet. It will take a number of years to design the project and clean up and develop the site.

CONTINUED LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARING ON POINT WELLS SUBAREA PLAN AND PRE-ANNEXATION ZONING

Chair Wagner reviewed the rules and procedures for the public hearing. Commissioner Piro reminded the Commission that additional public comments would be limited to the modifications made to the staff's proposal since the December 3rd meeting.

Staff Overview and Presentation of Preliminary Staff Recommendation and Questions from the Commission Regarding Point Wells Subarea Plan

Mr. Tovar referred to the potential amendments to the subarea plan and the zoning map and text, which were made at the direction of the Commission. Some were specific requests by individual Commissioners, and others were raised during the Commission's previous study sessions. He also referred to the following additional exhibits that have been entered into the record since the Commission's last meeting:

- **Exhibit 25** – Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS).
- **Exhibit 26** – Email from Jan Bakken dated December 10, 2009.
- **Exhibit 27** – Comment letter from Chakorn Phisuthikul dated December 10, 2009.
- **Exhibit 28** – Suggested amendments to Subarea Plan and Zoning Ordinance.

- **Exhibit 29** – A map to clarify view corridor locations.
- **Exhibit 30** – A proposed revised zoning map with adjusted boundary between PLA 1A and PLA 1B.

Mr. Tovar referred to Exhibit 29, which is a map showing the location of the view corridor. The section line starts at the intersection of the County line and goes off at a 60-degree angle to the center line of Richmond Beach Road. It barely touches the perimeter of the large tank on the site. He advised that Exhibit 30 is the same zoning map that was presented before, but the line between PLA 1A and PLA 1B was adjusted to follow the view corridor line. He noted that the illustration includes some of the tanks and the bridge to provide reference points.

Mr. Tovar advised that after the Commission has accepted public comment on the amendments, they could deliberate and provide direction to the staff to incorporate amendatory language into the body of both of the documents. Staff would update the draft language and present it to the Commission at their first meeting in January. At that point, they could forward a recommendation to the City Council. He suggested the Commission not close the public hearing until they have reached their conclusions on both items and provided specific direction to staff.

Commissioner Pyle asked if the proposed subarea plan would have to be included as part of the City's once-a-year Comprehensive Plan amendment docket. Mr. Tovar answered that subarea plans are not limited to the once-a-year amendment process. However, amendments to adopted subarea plans are subject to the once-a-year requirement unless the Growth Management Hearings Board directs them to amend the subarea plan or the City Council declares an emergency amendment. He emphasized that there is no limit on zoning code amendments. Commissioner Pyle summarized that it is important to have more refined Comprehensive Plan language since revisions are limited to once a year. Mr. Tovar said that, practically speaking, the subarea plan could also be amended at any point if the City Council feels it is important.

Mr. Tovar referred to Mr. Ohlemkamp's request that the Commission delay taking action on the proposed subarea plan and pre-annexation zoning. He said it is important to keep in mind that the County has already made a policy decision that is currently being litigated. Therefore, it would be prudent for the City to likewise make a policy decision. Amendments could come out of on-going discussions between the City, Snohomish County, Town of Woodway, property owner, citizens of Richmond Beach, etc. He advised that the City Council would have a number of options to consider about whether or not to move forward, but he expressed his belief that stopping at this point in the process would not be in the City's best interest.

Mr. Tovar referred to Exhibit 28 (Page 21 of the Staff Report), which is a list of the potential subarea plan and pre-annexation zoning amendments. He and the Commission briefly reviewed each of the potential subarea plan amendments as follows:

- **Amendment 1** – Mr. Tovar advised that this amendment would add a new Policy PW-1A stating that the vision for Point Wells is to be an environmentally sustainable mixed-use community. Vice Chair Perkowski pointed out that the language proposed in Amendment 1 is related to the language

proposed in Amendment 9. Mr. Tovar explained that the language proposed in Amendment 9 assumes adoption of Amendment 1 and is intended to provide more policy information.

- **Amendment 2** – Mr. Tovar advised that this amendment would clarify the intent of the Transportation Implementation Plan by modifying PW-7 to indicate the City would not just require a transportation study, but an implementation plan, as well. The study would lead to the plan, and the plan would include schematic design and the other items that were listed previously. It would deal with issues related to all road segments and intersections between SR-104 and North 175th Street, with particular attention focused on Richmond Beach Drive and Richmond Beach Road. When the scope for the transportation study and plan is prepared, staff would follow the direction given in PW-7.

Commissioner Behrens pointed out that the proposed language does not identify an eastern boundary for the transportation study area. Mr. Tovar agreed and suggested the language be changed to identify I-5 as the eastern boundary. This would provide boundaries for all four sides of the study area. Vice Chair Perkowski asked if staff would provide an illustration to show the scope of the road segments and intersections. Mr. Tovar said this would be easy to provide and could be helpful. However, the policy already identifies clearly demarcated boundaries.

- **Amendment 3** – Mr. Tovar recalled there was a concern that the City might use dated information from the County to conduct their traffic and safety analysis, and the proposed language clarifies that the County information was used as background information and provided a basis for the City's conclusion that more information was needed before approval of a specific project at Point Wells.

Commissioner Pyle questioned the use of the term "should" in the last sentence of proposed Amendment 3 and questioned if "shall" would be a better term. Mr. Tovar answered that this is a policy statement, and the term "should" is appropriate.

- **Amendment 4** – Mr. Tovar recalled the Commission recommended the proposed language require both a Transportation Corridor Study and an Implementation Plan. Commissioner Piro recommended the study should also evaluate and expand bicycle and pedestrian safety and mobility and multi-modal strategies.
- **Amendment 5** – Mr. Tovar said additional language was added regarding the Transportation Implementation Plan and is verbatim from the email staff received from Commissioner Piro.

Commissioner Piro said he believes the language proposed in Amendment 5 accurately reflects the Commission's earlier discussion that any improvements that are developed at Point Wells, Richmond Highlands, and adjacent neighborhoods should look at opportunities for improving mobility of existing areas and not just exclusively the new development at Point Wells.

- **Amendment 6** – Mr. Tovar explained that this potential amendment would insert words into PW-7 to be clear they are not just talking about a transportation study, but also an implementation plan. Commissioner Piro suggested the study and transportation plan should identify needed investments

and services, including design and financing, for multimodal solutions to improve mobility and accessibility within the Richmond Beach Neighborhood and adjacent communities. In addition PW-8 and PW-9 should be changed to clarify that a Transportation Corridor Study and Implementation Plan would be required.

- **Amendment 7** – Mr. Tovar observed that, historically, there has not been a lot of multimodal activity in this area. The road network was built a long time ago, and mobility and accessibility in Richmond Beach and nearby areas has been dominated by single-occupancy vehicles. The City has policies that talk about improving pedestrian bike facilities, but most have not been implemented because of financial constraints. The proposed policy objective makes the observation that the Richmond Beach Corridor has been served by a Metro route. Although rail service at Richmond Beach has been talked about in the past, no service is identified in Sound Transit's adopted 20-year plan. The proposed language points out that while improved transit, bicycle and pedestrian mobility is a long-term policy objective, the majority of trips in the area are likely to continue to be by automobiles that utilize the road network.

Mr. Tovar said the amendment also includes changes to PW-9 to require the City to address opportunities to improve mobility, accessibility, and multimodal east-west movement in the Richmond Beach Road Corridor between Puget Sound and I-5 as part of the update of the city-wide Transportation Master Plan. Staff met yesterday with representatives from Sound Transit, who are looking at light rail alignments. Their decisions must be meshed with the City's Transportation Master Plan and Comprehensive Plan update. For example, one of the station areas is at 185th and I-5, so everything between Richmond Beach and the station should be examined as potential multimodal opportunities.

Commissioner Piro pointed out that the language he proposed was an attempt to respond to Chair Wagner's earlier comment that the language considered on December 3rd seemed very abrupt and needed more context. He felt staff did a good job of responding to this concern.

Chair Wagner asked if the City would be responsible for addressing additional multimodal opportunities, or if the traffic study would recommend opportunities for the City to implement. Mr. Tovar recalled Commissioner Broili's recommendation that the Commission view the long-term implications of the proposed language.

- **Amendment 8** – Mr. Cohn advised that the proposed amendment would expand the language in the section titled, "Future Vision for Point Wells," to incorporate issues raised at the end of the December 3rd meeting regarding future opportunities and eventualities for the Point Wells site and adjacent neighborhoods and communities after development occurs. The language is intended to point out that although the proposed subarea plan would be a 20-year document, the City should think beyond 20 years. The City should also consider the long-range costs of the near-term and mid-term actions.

Commissioner Piro recalled that Commissioner Broili expressed a need to look aspirationally at other eventualities and accommodate them as the area evolves and matures. The City should be aware of new practices for environmental restoration, maintenance improvements, etc.

- **Amendment 9** – Mr. Tovar said proposed Amendment 9 would add language at the end of PW-1A to incorporate some of the thinking about naming not just lands within 200 feet of the shoreline, but also the aquatic lands, as something that should be carefully designed and implemented to minimize impacts and achieve long-term sustainability. New bulkheads would not be permitted, and the detrimental effects of existing bulkheads should be reduced by using alternative, more natural stabilization techniques. Vice Chair Perkowski asked why the proposed amendment uses the word restoration. He suggested there is more to it than just restoration. The Commission agreed to discuss this issue as part of their deliberation.

Public Testimony on Revisions to Proposed Point Wells Subarea Plan

Wendy DiPeso, Shoreline, questioned if the transportation plan requirement would look beyond the traffic impacts at Point Wells to include other development projects that are going on close by. Mr. Tovar said that before any development occurs at Point Wells, the City will have completed their Transportation Master Plan update, which will provide information about background traffic (traffic generated by other developments expected to occur under the plans that are in place). Background traffic will be factored into the forecasts for future traffic impacts to the City's road grid.

Commissioner Piro observed that some of the potential amendments are related to the Transportation Study and Implementation Plan to ensure that it captures development not only at Point Wells, but along the Corridor and adjacent neighborhoods, as well.

Michael Strand, Shoreline, said he believes the anticipated 8,250 additional vehicle trips per day from the Point Wells site is too high, and it is unconscionable the City would consider a number that is even 1/10 that high. The additional traffic would have a significant impact on the Richmond Beach Neighborhood, as well as other properties on the west side of Aurora Avenue. He pointed out that not all the traffic must come through Richmond Beach. However, creating an annexation plan for the Point Wells site would force the impacts from Point Wells to come through Richmond Beach. Another option would be for the City to oppose the annexation and let the project develop as part of Snohomish County. The City could block the road, with the exception of allowing historical access on Richmond Beach Drive, and all of the problems would go away. If the property is annexed into the City as proposed, the developer would have total control over what happens in the area and all of the impacts would go through Shoreline. This would be a travesty for the citizens of Shoreline, and there will be no benefits.

Mr. Tovar explained that staff has talked to the City Attorney and reviewed existing rights-of-way, regulations that apply to environmentally sensitive areas and steep slopes, and existing code requirements in Woodway and Snohomish County. They are also aware of what the State Growth Management Act says about critical areas. People have suggested a road be developed to the north following the tracks to Edmonds, and they have also suggested new switchback roads going up the hill into the bluff area and connecting back to 238th in Woodway. However, there are a number of legal, environmental and political reasons why the City of Shoreline does not believe these other options would be practical. He noted that legal access has been made available to Point Wells through Shoreline for decades, and the City does not have the legal authority to close this access. If Woodway were to

create a public right-of-way down to the property through the Town of Woodway, the circumstances would be different.

Mr. Tovar explained that, as proposed, 8,250 additional vehicle trips would not be an absolute legal right of the property owner. The City would have some choice about how many vehicle trips that would accept, but keeping it to what it has been historically is unlikely to prevail long term. Snohomish County would permit some type of development of greater density than what is currently on the site. Their proposed urban center designation would allow twice the vehicle count that is proposed by Shoreline as a maximum. He clarified that the traffic analysis in the SEIS identifies a tipping point of 8,250, beyond which more of the City's intersections would experience failure. He emphasized that the property owner has not completed an architectural analysis of what can be done on the property. However, he expressed his belief that the developer would not likely be able to fit such an intense development on the property given the proposed setback and zoning requirements. It is unlikely the development would result in 8,250 vehicle trips per day.

Commission Deliberations on Proposed Point Wells Subarea Plan and Vote by Commission to Recommend Approval or Denial or Modification

COMMISSIONER PIRO MOVED THE COMMISSION RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED SUBAREA PLAN FOR POINT WELLS WITH ADDITIONAL COMMISSION AMENDMENTS. COMMISSIONER PYLE SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Piro expressed his belief that the proposed language is a sound approach for the City to take to get a subarea plan and pre-annexation zoning in place. The language expresses the Commission's intention and desire for the area. The Commission has received excellent input from the staff and the public. In addition, they had a very rich conversation at their last meeting that provided solid rationale for the proposed amendments that have been crafted and brought before the Commission for consideration. Commissioner Pyle concurred.

Commissioner Piro referred to Amendment 1 and expressed his belief that it is very good to have an overall policy to introduce the intent of the proposal. The language proposed for PW-1A ties in well with the City's existing Comprehensive Plan, and he likes the fact that it relates very squarely to sustainability and the excellent work the City has already done to adopt a sustainability strategy.

COMMISSIONER BEHRENS MOVED THE COMMISSION APPROVE AMENDMENT 1. COMMISSIONER PYLE SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Wagner pointed out that the language should be changed to replace "has provided" with "provides." The remainder of the Commission concurred.

Commissioner Behrens said the proposed amendment is well written and adds substantially to the subarea plan. Commissioner Pyle added that the proposed amendment meshes well with the existing Comprehensive Plan and the City's Environmental Sustainability Strategy. It will also allow for the

efficient use of space at the site and promote the preservation of certain features that are important to the community.

THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT 1, TO READ AS FOLLOWS:

“PW 1A: The Vision for Point Wells is an environmentally sustainable mixed-use community that is a model of environmental restoration, low-impact and climate-friendly sustainable development practices, and which provides extensive public access to the Puget Sound with a variety of trails, parks, public and semi-public spaces.”

COMMISSIONER BEHRENS MOVED THE COMMISSION APPROVE AMENDMENT 2. COMMISSIONER PIRO SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Behrens said the whole idea of doing a transportation implementation plan is good, and the additional language makes the requirement even better. It provides clarity and would involve various communities and organizations in the process. A very precise traffic management plan would be required in order for the area adjacent to Point Wells to continue to function.

Commissioner Piro expressed his belief that the proposed language responds to not only the Commission’s direction to expand the study area, but is also very sensitive to public concerns. They want more than just a traffic study; they want implementation of a traffic plan. They want the end product to not only serve the Point Wells property, but the adjacent communities, as well.

Commissioner Piro said he originally thought the language should also address options for a Sound Transit light rail station connection when focusing on various modes of travel along the Corridor. However, he said he is comfortable leaving the language as it is, knowing that decisions related to light rail have not yet been worked out. The other policies include provisions to address this issue, as well.

Commissioner Behrens suggested that the last sentence be changed to include I-5. Commissioner Pyle recommended that “transit” be inserted between “vehicular” and “bicycle” in the last sentence. Commissioner Piro suggested that “investments” replace “improvements” in the last sentence and throughout the Subarea Plan.

Commissioner Piro explained that while public works and engineering staff see anything they are able to build and/or construct as being an improvement, there are necessities that members of the community might not view as improvements. He said he prefers a more neutral term such as “investment.” Mr. Tovar added that using the term “investment” would also encompass programs such as public education and information.

THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT 2, WHICH WAS AMENDED TO READ AS FOLLOWS:

“PW-7: To enable appropriate traffic mitigation of future development at Point Wells, the developer should fund the preparation of a Transportation Corridor Study as the first phase of a Transportation Implementation Plan, under the direction of the City, with the input and participation of Woodway, Edmonds, Snohomish County and WSDOT. The Study and Transportation Implementation Plan should identify, engineer, and provide schematic design and costs for intersection, roadway, walkway and other public investments needed to maintain or improve vehicular, transit, bicycle and pedestrian safety and flow on all road segments and intersections between SR 104, N. 175th Street, and I-5 with particular attention focused on Richmond Beach Drive and Richmond Beach Road.”

The Commission agreed they would like staff to provide a graphic to illustrate this concept further. Mr. Tovar advised that the graphic could be provided at a later date.

COMMISSIONER PYLE MOVED THE COMMISSION APPROVE SUBAREA TEXT IN AMENDMENT 3 TO READ AS FOLLOWS:

“A traffic and safety analysis performed by the City in the summer of 2009 evaluated the nature and magnitude of impacts likely to accrue from the development of Point Wells as an “Urban Center” under Snohomish County zoning, as well as development scenarios assuming lesser orders of magnitude. This background information provided a basis for the City to conclude that, prior to the approval of any specific development project at Point Wells, the applicant for any development permit at Point Wells should fund, and the City oversee, the preparation of a detailed Transportation Corridor Study.”

COMMISSIONER PIRO SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Pyle expressed his belief that the amended language reads better and is more logical. Commissioner Piro agreed that the amended language is clearer and allows for changes that might take place in the future.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

COMMISSIONER PYLE MOVED THE COMMISSION APPROVE THE SUBAREA TEXT IN AMENDMENT 4. COMMISSIONER PIRO SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Pyle commented that the proposed amendment clarifies why the study is needed and provides more direction. Commissioner Piro recalled that Commissioner Broili first introduced the idea that a multimodal approach needs to be deliberately articulated in the proposed language. He said he likes the additional language about addressing bicycle and pedestrian mobility, as well. The City has a real opportunity to enhance and develop improved bicycle and walking opportunities in the entire area.

Commissioner Behrens recommended that “State Route 99” should be replaced with “Interstate 5.” Mr. Cohn pointed out that Amendment 4 is intended to specifically apply to Richmond Beach Drive and Richmond Beach Road. Commissioner Behrens said he understands that they are dealing with Richmond Beach Road, but the impacts will not stop at State Route 99. If they are going to expand on

the idea of improving bicycle and pedestrian safety and mobility, the more reasonable option would be to extend the improvements all the way to Interstate 5 where transit is available.

Commissioner Piro pointed out that previous policy statements clearly define the Corridor, so there is really no need to redefine the boundaries in Proposed Amendment 4. He suggested they delete the reference to NW 205th and State Route 99, altogether.

Chair Wagner suggested the second sentence be refined to make it clear that the intent is to affect improvements. She cautioned that the City would not want to require improvements or investments along every intersection and road between Point Wells and Interstate 5. While they want the study to be comprehensive to identify where major impacts would occur and how they would be addressed, the Richmond Beach Corridor is the main focus of this particular policy statement.

Commissioner Pyle pointed out that Amendment 4 is intended to be a specific statement about the Richmond Beach Corridor, but the current proposal does not clearly define the Corridor. He suggested the Corridor be defined as "all the way from the Point Wells site to State Route 99 and the intersections in between." Commissioner Behrens pointed out that the Corridor is defined in Amendment 2, and this definition should be consistent throughout the proposed subarea plan.

Commissioner Pyle suggested the first sentence of the proposed amendment be changed to read, "The Study should include an evaluation of projected impacts on vehicular flow . . ." He agreed there is no need to include another statement that describes the Corridor. The remainder of the Commission concurred.

Commissioner Piro agreed with Chair Wagner that the second sentence of Amendment 4 is awkward. Mr. Cohn suggested the second sentence be changed to read, "The study should also evaluate expanded bicycle and pedestrian safety and mobility investments, and identify "context sensitive design" treatments for intersections, road segments, block faces, crosswalks and walkways in the study area . . ." He suggested the that requiring context sensitive treatments for every intersection may be too extensive. Mr. Tovar agreed it would be appropriate to make the statement more general, as long as they recognize the amendment was intended to respond to public comments. He suggested "as appropriate" could replace "every." He emphasized that pedestrian and bicycle movement and safety are issues west of State Route 99.

Chair Wagner suggested that if the language is changed as recommended by staff, it would merely restate the policy statement. She reminded the Commission that the policy statement indicates that particular attention should be focused on Richmond Beach Drive and Richmond Beach Road. She suggested the language should make it clear that context sensitive design treatments should be identified for every intersection on the Corridor.

Commissioner Piro recommended the second sentence of Amendment 4 be changed to read, "The Study should evaluate expanded bicycle and pedestrian safety and mobility investments and identify appropriate context sensitive design treatments for intersections, road segments, block faces, crosswalks, and walkways in the study area with emphasis on Richmond Beach Road and Richmond Beach Drive."

Commissioner Pyle pointed out that the last sentence of Amendment 4 is duplicative of PW-7 and could be eliminated.

Commissioner Behrens said another option is to amend the second sentence to read, "The Study should evaluate and recommend improvements for bicycle and pedestrian safety and mobility. The remainder of the sentence could be deleted. Commissioner Piro said he would like to retain the language related to context sensitive design, since it is important that treatments are designed to fit the neighborhood.

Vice Chair Perkowski suggested that "identify" would also be a more appropriate word than "recommend." The remainder of the Commission concurred.

THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT 4, WHICH WAS AMENDED TO READ AS FOLLOWS:

"The Transportation Corridor Study and Implementation Plan should include an evaluation of projected impacts on vehicular flow and levels of service at every intersection and road segment in the Corridor. The study should also evaluate and identify expanded bicycle and pedestrian safety and mobility investments and identify "context sensitive design" treatments as appropriate for intersections, road segments, block faces, crosswalks, and walkways in the study area, with emphasis on Richmond Beach Road and Richmond Beach Drive."

COMMISSIONER PIRO MOVED THE COMMISSION APPROVE THE SUBAREA TEXT IN AMENDMENT 5. COMMISSIONER BEHRENS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Piro advised that Amendment 5 is intended to provide clarification. Commissioner Behrens said the amendment language is well written and precise. It sets the ground work for the policies that come after.

Chair Wagner proposed that the last sentence be changed to replace "than current" with "that currently."

THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT 5, WHICH WAS AMENDED TO READ AS FOLLOWS:

"A Transportation Implementation Plan - a Corridor Study would be a step in the development of such a plan. The scope of the transportation plan should include a multimodal approach to mobility and accessibility to and from Point Wells, as well as detailed planning for investments and services to improve multimodal travel for adjacent communities between Point Wells and I-5. This could well include an integrated approach to accessing Point Wells, the Richmond Beach neighborhood, and Richmond Highlands with the Bus Rapid Transit system along Aurora Avenue, the I-5 Corridor itself - focusing on the interchanges at N. 205th and N. 175th, as well as the Sound Transit light rail stations serving Shoreline."

While the analysis of vehicle flows is appropriate as part of the study, the solutions should provide alternatives to vehicle travel to and from Point Wells - as well as more transportation choices than

those that currently exist today for the Richmond Beach neighborhood and adjacent communities."

**COMMISSIONER PYLE MOVED THE COMMISSION APPROVE AMENDMENT 6.
COMMISSIONER PIRO SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Commissioner Pyle observed that the changes are intended to make the language consistent with the previous paragraphs. Commissioner Piro concurred. However, he suggested that "public improvements" be changed to "public investments."

Chair Wagner pointed out that the language in Amendment 6 is intended to apply to communities adjacent to Point Wells, so the language should be changed to make this clearer. Commissioner Piro added that the amendment is intended to apply to adjacent communities along the Corridor and not just Point Wells.

Mr. Tovar pointed out that "Study and Transportation Plan" should be changed to "Transportation Corridor Study and Implementation Plan." The remainder of the Commission agreed that the term should be used consistently throughout the document.

Commissioner Pyle expressed his concern that PW-9 is one of the most important pieces of the subarea plan, and further discussion would be appropriate. The Commission agreed to eliminate the language in Amendment 6 related to PW-9, and then deal with PW-9 separately.

**THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF
AMENDMENT 6, WHICH WAS AMENDED TO READ AS FOLLOWS:**

"PW-7: To enable appropriate traffic mitigation of future development at Point Wells, the developer should fund the preparation of a Transportation Corridor Study as the first phase of a Transportation Implementation Plan, under the direction of the City, with the input and participation of Woodway, Edmonds, Snohomish County and WSDOT. The Study and Transportation Implementation Plan should identify, engineer, and provide schematic design and costs for intersection, roadway, walkway and other public improvements investments needed to maintain or improve vehicular, transit, bicycle and pedestrian safety and flow on all road segments and intersections between SR 104, and N. 175th Street, and I-5 with particular attention focused on Richmond Beach Drive and Richmond Beach Road. The Study and Transportation Plan should identify needed investments and services, including design and financing, for multimodal solutions to improving mobility and accessibility within the Richmond Beach neighborhood and adjacent communities, including but not limited to investments on Richmond Beach Drive and Richmond Beach Road."

"PW-8: The needed mitigation improvements identified in the Transportation Corridor Study and Implementation Plan should be built and operational concurrent with the occupancy of the phases of development at Point Wells." (Note: PW-9 would be dealt with separately.)

COMMISSIONER PIRO MOVED THE COMMISSION APPROVE THE SUBAREA TEXT PORTION OF AMENDMENT 7. (Note: PW-9 would be dealt with separately.) VICE CHAIR PERKOWSKI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Piro recalled that Chair Wagner previously recommended that language be amended to provide more context, and the proposed language addresses her concerns. However, he suggested the language could have also introduced the City's approach to Level of Service (LOS). He said he would share his ideas when the Commission specifically discusses PW-9.

Chair Wagner pointed out that the proposed language uses the number identified in the City's traffic study, which is the most professional opinion the Commission has on the matter. She expressed her belief that it is appropriate to reference the study and include the numbers as a baseline for which subsequent decisions would be made.

THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT 7 TO READ AS FOLLOWS:

"Historically, mobility and accessibility in Richmond Beach and adjacent communities has been dominated by the single occupancy vehicle. Provision of bicycle and pedestrian facilities has been limited because retrofitting an existing road network with these facilities is an expensive undertaking. The Richmond Beach Road Corridor is served by a single Metro route and, though rail service to a station in Richmond Beach was evaluated by Sound Transit, no service is envisioned in the transit agency's adopted 20 year plan. Though improved transit, bicycle and pedestrian mobility is a long-term policy objective, the majority of trips in the area will likely continue to be by automobiles utilizing the road network. The City's traffic study completed in 2009 shows that if more than 8,250 vehicle trips a day enter the City's road network from Point Wells, it would result in a level of service "F" or worse at a number of City intersections. This would be an unacceptable impact.

Therefore, the City should establish a maximum daily traffic trip threshold originating from Point Wells and require preparation of a Transportation Corridor Study to identify necessary mitigations."
(Note: PW-9 would be dealt with separately.)

COMMISSIONER PIRO MOVED THE COMMISSION APPROVE AMENDMENT 8. COMMISSIONER PYLE SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Piro commended Mr. Cohn for doing a great job of capturing the Commission's intent and finding a solution to the valid and rich issue raised by Commissioner Broili at the last meeting.

Chair Wagner observed that the first paragraph talks about working with the Town of Woodway to reduce potential impacts, and she questioned if the language should include the City of Edmonds, as well. She noted that the policy statement references both the Town of Woodway and Snohomish County. Mr. Tovar referred to a letter the City received from the City of Edmonds discussing their concerns about impacts on SR-104 as it travels through their City. At the time the language was drafted,

they had not yet received input from the City of Edmonds. He agreed it would be appropriate to name Edmonds in the proposed amendment, as well. The Commission concurred.

Commissioner Pyle noted that "years" should be added after the second "20" in the language proposed by staff.

Commissioner Behrens referred to the wording in the last sentence. Rather than connecting Woodway to Puget Sound, the goal is to connect Woodway to Point Wells via bicycle. Mr. Tovar said the language was drafted to recognize that the Woodway community would like an opportunity to access the saltwater shoreline below. He explained that City staff has been talking with the Town of Woodway for several months to identify their concerns and interests, and they indicated their desire to have access to Puget Sound. While the result would be the same either way, Commissioner Behrens once again suggested the language should talk about connecting Woodway and Point Wells.

THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT 8, WHICH WAS AMENDED TO READ AS FOLLOWS:

"Subarea Text: The City should work with the Town of Woodway and Edmonds to identify ways in which potential future development in the lowland portion of Point Wells could be configured or mitigated to reduce potential impacts on Woodway. There is no practical primary vehicular access to the lowland part of Point Wells other than via Richmond Beach Road. However, the City should work with property owners and Woodway to provide a bicycle and pedestrian route between Woodway and Point Wells.

The Growth Management Act states that cities, rather than county governments, are the preferred providers of urban governmental services. Because urban governmental services and facilities in Shoreline are much closer to Point Wells than are similar services and facilities located in Snohomish County, it is most efficient for the City to provide those services.

Working with its public safety partners, Shoreline Fire Department and Shoreline Police Department, the City should invite Snohomish County to discuss an interlocal agreement to address the timing and methods to transition local governmental responsibilities for Point Wells from the County to the City. Included in these discussions should be responsibilities for permitting and inspection of future development at Point Wells, and possible sharing of permitting or other local government revenues to provide an orderly transition.

PW-10: The City should work with both the Town of Woodway, Edmonds and Snohomish County toward adoption of interlocal agreements to address the issues of land use, construction management of, urban service delivery to, and local governance of Point Wells.

New text for Subarea Plan (directly under "A Future Vision for Point Wells"): The Subarea Plan, intended to be a 20-year plan document, envisions a Point Wells development that could take longer than 20 years to become fully realized. Because of the time horizon of the plan and future development, the City, in its decision-making, should consider the long-term costs of near-term actions and make choices that reflect a long-term perspective."

VICE CHAIR PERKOWSKI MOVED THE COMMISSION APPROVE AMENDMENT 9. COMMISSIONER PIRO SECONDED THE MOTION.

Vice Chair Perkowski reviewed that the proposed amendment is intended to provide more description about what is meant by “environmentally sustainable.” He said that while the Commission has had a lot of discussion about transportation impacts, they have not had an extensive discussion regarding environmental impacts. He observed that there is plenty of science to support the idea that one of the biggest problems with Puget Sound is the interruption of natural processes, particularly in the sensitive environments. There is also evidence about the destruction of habitat that is caused by bulkheads and hardened shoreline armory. The proposed language would be consistent with the City’s goal to be environmentally sustainable and have low impact. However, he suggested the language be amended to prohibit additional over-water structures and new bulkheads. He said there is scientific evidence about the negative impacts of these structures in the near shore environment.

Commissioner Piro agreed that the proposed amendment adds value and clarity, once again bringing in principles that have been developed in other City planning documents such as the Environmental Sustainability Strategy. Given the location of Point Wells, sustainability should be addressed as part of the subarea plan.

Commissioner Piro suggested the language in Amendment 9 be divided into two separate policies. One policy could talk more broadly about sustainability and the vision, and the second policy could talk specifically about the aquatic and shoreline issues. The remainder of the Commission concurred.

Vice Chair Perkowski suggested that “restoration of” be changed to “uses and development of and near.” Chair Wagner asked if the language is intended to include restoration activities, as well. Vice Chair Perkowski answered affirmatively.

Commissioner Pyle suggested the last sentence be changed to require that existing bulkheads be removed and replaced with alternative, more natural stabilization techniques. Vice Chair Perkowski said he likes the idea of removing existing bulkheads, but there may be situations where removal would not be feasible or appropriate.

Mr. Tovar reminded the Commission that a Shoreline Master Program amendment would come before them in 2010, and they will review each of these issues in great detail. He suggested the policy statement should remain general, merely indicating concern about environmental issues. He emphasized that the subarea plan and pre-annexation zoning will not be the only regulations that govern what happens with the bulkheads. The Shoreline Master Program would determine whether or not it is appropriate to remove a bulkhead and how it should be removed to minimize contamination.

THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT 9, MAKING IT TWO SEPARATE POLICIES, TO READ AS FOLLOWS:

“PW-1A: The Vision for Point Wells is an environmentally sustainable mixed-use community that is a model of environmental restoration, low-impact and climate-friendly sustainable development

practices, and which has provided extensive public access to the Puget Sound with a variety of trails, parks, public and semi-public spaces.

PW-1B: Use and development of and near the Puget Sound shoreline and aquatic lands at Point Wells should be carefully designed and implemented to minimize impacts and achieve long-term sustainable systems. New bulkheads or over-water structures should not be permitted and the detrimental effects of existing bulkheads should be reduced through removal of bulkheads or alternative, more natural stabilization techniques."

COMMISSIONER PIRO MOVED THE COMMISSION APPROVE NEW TEXT FOR POLICY PW-9 TO READ AS FOLLOWS:

"The City should address opportunities to improve mobility, accessibility, and multimodal east-west movement in the Richmond Beach Road Corridor between Puget Sound and I-5 as part of the update of the city-wide Transportation Management Plan. Maximum daily traffic on Richmond Beach Drive from Point Wells should maintain a Level of Service (LOS) of C or better, in a manner that reduces existing single-occupancy vehicle trips in the Richmond Beach Road Corridor."

COMMISSIONER PYLE SECONDED THE MOTION

Commissioner Piro expressed his belief that the way the language was crafted with numeric targets satisfies some very solid work that staff has done to articulate something that avoids the worst case scenario. However, it also sounds like the City is settling for something that is a step above worst case scenario. Instead, they should talk about a whole system of movement and mobility into and out of the area that really seeks solutions that not only benefits the Point Wells development but the entire community. He said he would like to avoid the dramatic and seemingly overwhelming numbers. He suggested the City consider other options for developing transportation facilities and improving mobility in this area. If the development would introduce 825 additional peak hour trips, something else needs to happen to take 825 of the current trips off the streets so there would be no net gain. He said he envisions opportunities to pair a light rail station at 185th with a neighborhood hub transit station at Richmond Beach. He summarized that the City needs to look at a solution that serves the existing communities, as well as the residents of the new development at Point Wells. It is important to offer the entire community better options for transit and other non-motorized transportation.

Commissioner Pyle said he likes the language proposed by Commissioner Piro because it relies more on the actual LOS. They should keep in mind that the subarea plan is intended to be a 20-year plan, and the numbers identified in the Transportation Study may not be viable in the next 20 years. Relying on LOS would be more consistent with the modeling at the time a proposal goes forward.

Chair Wagner pointed out that the traffic study identifies that some intersections are anticipated to have an LOS that is less than Level C by 2025, even without the additional traffic from Point Wells. Commissioner Piro said he would be open to changing the LOS he identified in his proposed language. He said he does not believe it is unrealistic to maintain a Level C or D on the Corridor while taking on additional development. He said the proposed language helps communicate the City's vision if the

property is not annexed to the City and becomes an urban center as part of Snohomish County. He said he knows of no urban center in the region that is not expected to maintain LOS and move towards a mixed mode of travel with a transit component.

Commissioner Behrens observed that the transportation matrix is what makes redevelopment of Point Wells so difficult. Absent the transportation issues, everyone would love for Point Wells to be redeveloped. He suggested the City should strive to create policy language that minimizes private vehicle transit. The Transportation Corridor and Implementation Study should not assume there would be 8,250 trips per day. Instead, it should assume the minimum possible impact to the community, and it should be the developer's responsibility to design a project that accomplishes that goal. He summarized that a plan that allows 8,250 cars to drive a mile to meet a major transit station would be better than allowing 8,250 cars to travel 15 miles through streets and neighborhoods. He said they should talk about LOS and its impact on the community and not the number of vehicle trips.

Chair Wagner referred to the concept of "casual carpool" which is utilized in San Francisco and Washington, D.C. Encouraging casual carpools could be an opportunity to move traffic through the City faster. Commissioner Piro encouraged the Commission to think beyond private vehicles. There are rich opportunities associated with connecting the neighborhood hub that already exists at Richmond Beach to the proposed Sound Transit light rail station and the emerging Town Center at 185th and Aurora Avenue North.

Chair Wagner suggested that instead of requiring that maximum daily traffic on Richmond Beach Road from Point Wells should maintain an LOS of C or better, they could incorporate language that would not allow the LOS to drop more than one level. Commissioner Piro reminded the Commission that the Transportation Master Plan Update would provide new direction related to LOS.

Mr. Tovar suggested that perhaps it would be appropriate to use both standards. He noted that staff's proposed language indicates that traffic shall not exceed 8,250 trips per day, but it does not say that traffic would be allowed to reach that point. He pointed out that given the existing LOS, an additional 8,250 trips per day would create too much failure. Perhaps the policy could be amended to not exceed 8,250 trips per day or whatever LOS is adopted for the Corridor as part of the City's Transportation Master Plan Update, which will be completed in 2010. The Commission agreed a combination of the two standards would be appropriate. However, Commissioner Piro expressed his desire for the language to be more aspirational.

Commissioner Pyle expressed his belief that there is some benefit associated with using a fixed numbers to limit what can happen. However, if the City desires to assume a form-based code that is more reliant on the design of the site and less concerned about what is inside the buildings, the Commission should keep in mind that using fixed numbers is a reverse way of implementing a density cap. Mr. Tovar reminded the Commission that most of the public concerns were related to traffic impacts. The proposed language would identify a benchmark and then let the applicant figure out how to make it work. He said he is not sure the property could be developed to a density that would reach the maximum 8,250 vehicle trips per day given the other code requirements that would also apply.

Commissioner Pyle pointed out that a fixed number would be non-negotiable. Using an LOS standard would allow a developer to redesign the entire transportation Corridor, with the City's participation, and fund the entire rebuild of the Corridor to get more density. The drop in LOS could be mitigated by improving the infrastructure to raise the LOS. Mr. Tovar summarized that if intersections are rebuilt to improve their functionality, they will have a greater capacity to accommodate traffic before the LOS drops. Chair Wagner agreed this would address potential problems at intersections, but not all the other real or perceived impacts related to traffic flow.

Commissioner Behrens pointed out that Snohomish County experienced a similar situation at 164th Street where a huge number of apartment complexes were being built along the Corridor, creating traffic congestion. Instead of a building moratorium, the developers agreed to contribute a certain amount of money for each new unit that was built to fund transit. This would allow them to offset the additional number of people by building up the transit Corridor. He suggested the City do something similar as part of their Transportation Corridor Study and Implementation Plan. The City could require the developer to come up with a system that moves people without using cars.

Commissioner Piro suggested another option would be to have the developer build the Sounder Station along the commuter rail lines. The introduction of additional transit options (commuter rail, bus transit connecting to State Route 99 or Link Light Rail) could result in no additional trips on Shoreline streets. While the Point Wells development could introduce 800 new trips onto Shoreline streets, 800 existing trips could be removed by the addition of these new transit options, resulting in no net gain. He said he appreciates the value of including absolute numbers, but it should be clear that the City is not willing to reach a failure situation. They must maintain an acceptable LOS that meets established public policy and the mobility goals of the City. Any development at Point Wells should be required to make a contribution.

Commissioner Pyle suggested the following language: "The maximum daily traffic the City should permit on Richmond Beach Drive from the Point Wells development should not exceed 8,250 vehicle trips per day or a maximum peak hour rate of 825 and shall not reduce the LOS below the existing documented standard at the point of complete application." This language would establish 8,250 as a tangible cap on traffic, and they would not be allowed to reduce the LOS below the existing standard. The developer would not be penalized for the fact that the City already has a failing system, but they would not be allowed to make it worse.

Mr. Tovar reminded the Commission that if the property is developed as part of Snohomish County, the County has indicated they would rely on the City of Shoreline to identify the necessary traffic improvements to mitigate the impacts. They would rely on the City's analysis of the existing transportation system.

Commissioner Piro summarized that PW-9 could be amended to incorporate the first sentence in the language proposed by staff and an additional sentence to read, "These opportunities should be pursued in a manner that reduces existing single-occupancy vehicle trips in the Richmond Beach Road Corridor."

Again, Commissioner Pyle expressed his belief that the property owner should not be penalized if the City's system is already failing. At the same time, they should not penalize existing property owners who live near the project by allowing the new development to cause the system to fail.

Chair Wagner said she understands the concept of not allowing a developer to further degrade the LOS, but requiring them to raise the LOS if it is already below the City's adopted standard might not be appropriate. Commissioner Piro pointed out that although LOS for single-occupancy vehicles may be poor, the Corridor could be designed to allow buses through. As long as the people-moving capacity is functioning well, the LOS would remain at an acceptable level. He said he anticipates the updated Transportation Master Plan would address LOS more comprehensively, including opportunities for improved transit service.

Again, Chair Wagner expressed concern that the proposed language would require a developer to improve the LOS if it is already below the City's adopted LOS. Mr. Cohn explained that if the developer were to mitigate by providing bus service, etc., the LOS would remain the same. Chair Wagner pointed out that a developer may not be able to sufficiently mitigate to bring the LOS up to the City's adopted standard.

Commissioner Piro said there is an adequate facility expectation already in State Law through the concurrency provisions, which requires cities to have adequate facilities and services in place to serve development. The notion is that these services and facilities must be in place by the time the development is occupied or they are part of an anticipated capital improvement program within the next six years. He suggested that the proposed language would be consistent with what is already codified in State Law. If there are situations where the facilities and services are inadequate, a developer would be obligated to address the situation. Commissioner Pyle asked if the City also has an obligation to meet its adopted LOS. Mr. Tovar answered that the Growth Management Act prohibits the City from issuing a permit if a project would drop the LOS below the City's adopted standard. While this provision works well for properties within the City, the Point Wells property is not located in Shoreline. If the property is redeveloped under Snohomish County, the City would not have the ability to deny a permit even if the project would drop traffic functionality at intersections to below the City's adopted LOS.

Commissioner Pyle inquired if the City could adopt an LOS standard that is above what currently exists without a capital improvement project that would allow them to reach the new standard. Mr. Tovar explained that local governments have the authority to figure out where they want to draw the line, but they cannot issue permits for projects that will drop them below the adopted threshold. In these situations, an intersection must either be improved or the City must lower its standard.

Commissioner Piro pointed out that the currently proposed language would give the City some leverage to negotiate the future LOS. And the LOS standard would be specifically addressed as part of the Transportation Master Plan. The Commission emphasized that the proposed language would require a developer to meet the LOS and the maximum vehicle trips per day requirements. It would also stay current with the LOS standard that is in place at the time of application. They agreed the language should be divided into two separate policies.

THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT 9, MAKING IT TWO SEPARATE POLICIES TO READ AS FOLLOWS:

“PW-9A: The City should address opportunities to improve mobility, accessibility, and multimodal east-west movement in the Richmond Beach Road Corridor between Puget Sound and I-5 as part of the update of the city-wide Transportation Management Plan. These opportunities should be pursued in a manner that reduces existing single occupancy vehicle trips in the Corridor.

PW-9B: The maximum daily traffic that the City should permit emanating from Point Wells may not exceed 8,250 vehicle trips per day, nor reduce the City’s adopted level of service standards for the Corridor at the time of application for development permits at Point Wells.”

Commissioner Pyle suggested that PW-6 should not allow trees and vegetation to be cut to protect a view corridor. Commissioner Piro suggested the term “public view” would make the policy more clear. He also questioned if “view shed” instead of “view corridor” would help distinguish this policy from other situations that include the word “view.” Mr. Tovar pointed out that Zoning Amendment 5 would replace “view corridors” with “public view corridors.” He noted there is only one view corridor identified on the proposed zoning map. He explained that the proposed pre-annexation zoning makes it clear that PW-6 applies to buildings and not trees and other vegetation.

Chair Wagner referred to Mr. Phisuthikul’s comment about PW-6 and how the view corridor was measured. Mr. Tovar advised that this issue is clarified in the pre-annexation zoning. She also referred to Mr. Phisuthikul’s recommendation that PW-4 be amended to change “six stories” to “65 feet.” She noted the Commission previously discussed this issue and agreed that the appropriate term was “65 feet.”

COMMISSIONER PYLE MOVED THE COMMISSION SWITCH THE ORDER OF PW-5 AND PW-6. COMMISSIONER PIRO SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

THE COMMISSION VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THE MAIN MOTION TO RECOMMEND ADOPTION OF THE PROPOSED SUBAREA PLAN FOR POINT WELLS AS AMENDED BY THE PREVIOUS MOTIONS.

Staff Overview and Presentation of Preliminary Staff Recommendation and Questions from the Commission Regarding Proposed Point Wells Pre-Annexation Zoning Text and Map

Mr. Tovar reviewed the potential amendments to the Point Wells Pre-Annexation Zoning as follows:

- **Amendment 2.** Mr. Tovar said Vice Chair Perkowski and others raised the issue of whether there should be a requirement for site plan approval. The proposed amendment would require that any application for site plan approval must be processed as a Type C Permit. That means the Planning Commission would conduct a public hearing and make a recommendation to the City Council. The amendment would also state that no building, grading, or other development permits would be issued

until the City has first given site plan approval and an administrative design review permit is processed and approved by the Planning Commission or the Planning Director.

- **Amendment 3.** Mr. Tovar said Vice Chair Perkowski cautioned that the language should not just address land that is landward 200 feet, but also aquatic lands.
- **Amendment 4.** Mr. Tovar said a few of the Commissioners expressed concern that not all of the things on the list of mandated items that must included in a restoration plan would be practical or appropriate. The original language was mandatory and prescriptive, and the amended language is more flexible to identify items that should be addressed. A feasibility assessment could be done to identify those that are practical, and a final judgment could be made at the time of permit evaluation.
- **Amendment 5.** Mr. Tovar advised that this amendment would replace all references to “view corridors” with “public view corridors.”
- **Amendment 6.** Mr. Tovar said Commissioners previously made the point that the City does not want to require that all fill be removed, just contaminated fill. The amendment would add the word “contaminated” before “fill.”
- **Amendment 7.** Mr. Tovar advised that the proposed amendment would provide more clarification about the requirements for the portions of buildings that are higher than 65 feet. The portions of the buildings that are lower than 65 feet could be closer than 100 feet, but the portions that are greater than 65 feet must be at least 100 feet away from each other. He noted that a drawing would be incorporated into the document to illustrate the intent.
- **Amendment 8.** Mr. Tovar said this amendment would delete the earlier language that talked about managing the stormwater. This would not be applicable since stormwater would be managed via direct flow because the property is located next to the Sound.
- **Amendment 9.** Mr. Tovar advised that Amendment 9 would include a new map to illustrate how the view corridor was measured.
- **Amendment 1.** Mr. Tovar recalled that the question was previously asked about whether a property owner should be allowed to break the property up and have several different developments at Point Wells as opposed to one large master plan. The proposed amendment was intended to create an incentive for the developer to keep the property together by establishing a minimum acreage requirement. Any development in PLA 1A and PLA 1B would be subject to review of a comprehensive site plan for the entire property held in common ownership. The amendment is intended to make the point that just because PLA 1A and PLA 1B are zoned differently does not mean they should be developed separately. The site plan must be applied to all properties that are owned in common. Commissioner Pyle suggested that perhaps a developer could be allowed to divide the property into smaller pieces through a binding site plan process.

Public Testimony on Revisions to Proposal Regarding Proposed Point Wells Pre-Annexation Zoning Text and Map

Michael Strand, Shoreline, said he feels this is the City's one chance to keep Shoreline from becoming severely degraded by moving away from annexation. If the property is annexed, all of the problems will become Shoreline's issues to solve. He suggested the City rid themselves of the problem and isolate the problem in Snohomish County, which is where the project is located. It should be Snohomish County's responsibility to convince the residents of Woodway to support the project. The City should maintain the historic level of traffic on the Corridor rather than allowing access through Shoreline to Point Wells. The problems that have been discussed by the Commission would be non-existent. On the other hand, if the property is annexed to Shoreline, the City would be stuck with mitigating all the problems. He suggested the Planning Commission is more concerned about the people of Woodway and Snohomish County than they are about the problems the residents of Shoreline would have to deal with. He noted that about 200 cars pass his property each day, and the proposal would allow up to 8,250 additional cars. This would be a significant impact.

Commissioner Pyle said the Commission has considered the potential impacts associated with redevelopment at Point Wells. He explained it is not the Commission's intent to mount an effort to repel the development and/or annexation. Instead, they are working to put in place proper policy and planning standards that could be applied to future redevelopment at Point Wells rather than waiting for the court to mandate a settlement agreement.

Commissioner Behrens explained that if the City does nothing and Snohomish County decides to allow the development to occur at whatever level they feel is appropriate, the City would have no ability to control the situation, and the impacts could be significantly greater than those associated with Shoreline's proposed subarea plan and pre-annexation zoning. It is important that the City retain at least some control over future redevelopment of the property. He pointed out that Snohomish County has allowed development to occur outside of a city in unincorporated Snohomish County, and eventually the residents of the new development petition for annexation. The cities are required to provide services to the new developments, yet they have very little control over its impacts. The same would be the case with Point Wells. Services for the site would come from Shoreline, and it is important to create a way for the City to control the impacts as much as possible.

Commissioner Behrens emphasized that it would not be legally possible for the City to close the access to Point Wells. Mr. Strand agreed that the access could not be closed. However, the City is not required to provide access over and above the current level. He disagreed with the City's defacto assumption that all access must come through Richmond Beach. He recommended the City oppose the additional access since it would require them to accept responsibility for all of the consequences. The proposed development would end up destroying neighborhoods.

Commission Deliberations Regarding Proposed Point Wells Pre-Annexation Zoning and Vote by Commission to Recommend Approval or Denial or Modification

COMMISSIONER PIRO MOVED THE COMMISSION RECOMMEND ADOPTION OF THE PROPOSED PRE-ANNEXATION ZONING WITH ADDITIONAL COMMISSIONER AMENDMENTS. COMMISSIONER PYLE SECONDED THE MOTION.

COMMISSIONER PIRO MOVED THE COMMISSION APPROVE AMENDMENTS 2 THROUGH 9. COMMISSIONER PYLE SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Piro said a lot of good thinking went into the proposed amendments, both from Commission input and public comments. The proposed amendments would further improve the product. Commissioner Pyle concurred.

Commissioner Pyle recommended that Amendment 8 should be modified further. He said he believes that stormwater treatment should be required, but flow control would not be necessary. The remainder of the Commission concurred.

Vice Chair Perkowski recommended that the "Permitted and Prohibited Uses" language should be applied to the landward properties, but not the aquatic lands. This will require a definition or distinction between the two. Mr. Tovar suggested this issue would be better addressed as part of the Shoreline Master Program Update. He reminded the Commission that the Department of Ecology is very possessive of regulations within the Shoreline Management Act's jurisdiction, especially on the waterward side of the ordinary high-water line. Therefore, he cautioned against doing Shoreline Master Program work via the zoning code. Vice Chair Perkowski said Mr. Tovar's concerns would not prevent an amendment to Section 20.92.030 to make sure the language does include aquatic lands.

Commissioner Pyle inquired if the Shoreline Master Program Update would include a stand-alone use section. Mr. Tovar answered affirmatively. Vice Chair Perkowski said he still believes it would be a good idea to make it clear that the city would not support all of the listed uses in the aquatic lands. Mr. Tovar noted that zoning in the aquatic areas would be preempted by the Shoreline Master Program. Vice Chair Perkowski said he would like the language to be extremely limited as to what would be allowed in aquatic lands. As proposed, the language would apply to aquatic lands, which he cannot support. Mr. Tovar suggested that language could be provided to make it clear that any uses or developments that are otherwise prohibited by Chapter 90.50 would not be enabled or approved by this chapter of the zoning code. He clarified that the City's updated Shoreline Master Program would not apply to the Point Wells property unless and until it is annexed into the City.

The Commission discussed various options for incorporating language that would make it clear that none of the provisions of the chapter would be effective within the jurisdiction of the Shoreline Master Program if they are contrary to the provisions of Chapter 90.58 (Shoreline Master Program). Mr. Tovar suggested that this new language could be added in a new Section 20.92.015 – Relation to the Shoreline Management Act. Vice Chair Perkowski said that in addition to a new Section 20.92.015, he would also like to amend Section 20.92.030 so it does not include aquatic lands. The Commission concluded that the issue should be addressed by adding additional language after "Planned Area 1" in Section 20.92.030 to read, "except none of the provisions of this chapter refer in aquatic lands." In addition, language

should be added to the Purpose and Scope section to read, "Nothing in this chapter shall be contrary to or inconsistent with the provisions of 90.58."

Chair Wagner referred to Amendment 4 and suggested that "feasible" would be a better word than "practical." The remainder of the Commission concurred.

THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF AMENDMENTS 2 THROUGH 9, WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGES:

- *Amendment #8 – "retrofitting of existing impervious surfaces to include stormwater treatment and flow control."*
- *Section 20.92.030 – "All uses provided for under SMC 20.40.120-.140 (including unlisted uses under SMC 20.40.570) are permitted outright in Planned Area 1, except none of these provisions refer to aquatic lands. The following uses are prohibited in Planned Area 1 and its associated aquatic lands:"*
- *Section 20.92.010 – Add language to Purpose and Scope: "Nothing in this chapter shall be contrary to or inconsistent with the provisions of 90.58."*
- *Amendment #4 – feasible practical (last sentence)*

COMMISSIONER PYLE MOVED THE COMMISSION APPROVE THE AMENDED VERSION OF AMENDMENT 1. COMMISSIONER PIRO SECONDED THE MOTION.

Mr. Tovar recalled that the proposed acreage numbers must be modified if the boundary line is changed. He suggested the Commission direct the staff to update the minimum acreage numbers for Areas 1A, 1B and 1C based on the new boundaries. He noted that the minimum acreage requirement for Areas 1A and 1B would be equal to the total square footage of each area. He summarized that the purpose of having a minimum acreage requirement is to minimize the number of lots.

Commissioner Pyle suggested the Commission direct staff to modify the acreage by recalculating the total size of each of area based on the revised boundaries. The remainder of the Commission agreed that would be appropriate. Mr. Tovar clarified that the minimum acreage for each zone would be based on the entire area of the zone.

Commissioner Pyle clarified it is not the intent of this section to limit the future condominiumization or sale of an individual building, as long as the property is developed all at one time under one site plan. Mr. Tovar said the goal is to require that the property be designed and developed as a common site plan. While the proposed language would require a single owner to develop the property at the same time under a common site plan, the City cannot compel two different owners to have a common site plan. He cautioned that the City should avoid situations where the property is broken into separate subdivided parcels, and the proposed language would not prevent a developer from condominiumizing the development. Commissioner Pyle asked if the proposed language would prohibit a developer from dividing and selling a portion of property after the development is build out. Mr. Tovar answered no.

THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF A NEW SECTION 20.92.035 MINIMUM LOT SIZE AND SITE PLAN REVIEW WITH

ACREAGE TO BE DETERMINED BY RECALCULATING AREAS IN 1A, 1B AND 1C BASED ON REVISED BOUNDARIES.

COMMISSIONER PYLE MOVED THE COMMISSION RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE REVISED PROPOSED ZONING MAP WITH THE ADJUSTED BOUNDARY BETWEEN PLA 1A AND PLA 1B. COMMISSIONER BEHRENS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Pyle expressed his belief that the adjusted boundaries make sense given the view corridor and the proposal for different heights and development scenarios in the three areas. Chair Wagner added that the adjusted boundaries would enhance the developer's ability to have more space for parks, which is one of the zoning requirements.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

THE COMMISSION VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THE MAIN MOTION TO RECOMMEND ADOPTION OF THE PROPOSED PRE-ANNEXATION ZONING FOR POINT WELLS AS AMENDED BY THE PREVIOUS MOTIONS.

Commissioner Behrens recalled his previous recommendation that the City come up with some way to address unforeseen costs associated with road improvements. They talked about perhaps putting money in a reserve fund to cover unforeseen costs. Mr. Tovar said the City has never used this type of approach with prior projects. Their current process is to utilize existing information to forecast the needs, demands and impacts, and then assess improvement requirements. Programs such as transportation demand management could be required as permit conditions, and some adjustments to these programs could be made over time as conditions change. However, ongoing monitoring would be required in order for this type of program to be successful. Commissioner Behrens pointed out that the potential impacts depend upon the uses that are developed on the site. The Commission agreed to place this item on their "Parking Lot" agenda to discuss at a later date.

Closure of Public Hearing

Mr. Tovar reminded the Commission that, in the future, they should close the public hearing just prior to taking final action on an item.

The public hearing on the Point Wells Subarea Plan and Pre-Annexation Zoning was closed.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Tovar had no items to report.


UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business scheduled on the agenda.

seattletimes.com

PO Box 70, Seattle, WA 98111

SHORELINE CITY OF
KIM SULLIVAN
17500 MIDVALE AVE N
SHORELINE, WA 981334905



Re: Advertiser Account #6391000
Ad #: 794529900

Affidavit of Publication

4110612 / 2


STATE OF WASHINGTON
Counties of King and Snohomish

The undersigned, on oath states that he/she is an authorized representative of The Seattle Times Company, publisher of The Seattle Times of general circulation published daily in King and Snohomish Counties, State of Washington. The Seattle Times has been approved as a legal newspaper by orders of the Superior Court of King and Snohomish Counties.

The notice, in the exact form annexed, was published in the regular and entire issue of said paper or papers and distributed to its subscribers during all of the said period.

Newspaper	Publication Date
The Seattle Times	01/05/11

Agent MAUREEN E. DUGGAN Signature Maureen E. Duggan



Subscribed and sworn to before me on JANUARY 5, 2011
(DATE) Christina C. McKenna

(NOTARY SIGNATURE) Christina C. McKenna
Notary Public in and for the State of Washington, residing at Seattle



seattletimes.com

Re Advertiser Account #6391000

Ad # 794529900

Ad TEXT: The City of Shoreline Notice of Public Hearing of the Planning Commission and Threshold Determination

Description of Proposal:
The City of Shoreline proposes to change the street classification of Richmond Beach Drive NW between approximately NW 199th Street and the Snohomish County line from Collector Arterial to Local Street.

The City has issued a SEPA Determination of Non-significance (DNS). This Determination of Nonsignificance (DNS) is issued in accordance with WAC 197-11-340(2).

This may be your only opportunity to submit written comments, including comments on the environmental impacts of the proposal. Written comments must be received at the address listed below before 5:00

p.m. January 19, 2011. Please mail, fax (206) 801-2788 or deliver comments to the City of Shoreline, Attn: Steven Szafran, AICP 17500 Midvale Avenue North, Shoreline, WA 98133 or email to sszafran@shorelinewa.gov. Upon request, a copy of the final threshold determination for this proposal may be obtained together with the City Council decision on the proposal.

Interested persons are encouraged to provide oral and/or written comments regarding the above project at an open record public hearing. The hearing is scheduled for Thursday January 20, 2011 at 7:00 pm

at the City Hall, 17500 Midvale Avenue

North.

Copies of the proposal, SEPA Checklist and applicable codes are available for review at the City Hall, 17500 Midvale Avenue North.

Questions or More Information: Please contact Steven Szafran, Planning and Development Services at (206) 801-2512.

Any person requiring a disability accommodation should contact the City Clerk at (206) 801-2230 in advance for more information. For TTY telephone service call (206) 546-0457. Each request will be considered individually according to the type of request, the availability of resources, and the financial ability of the City to provide the requested services or equipment.



The City of Shoreline Notice of Public Hearing of the Planning Commission and Threshold Determination

Description of Proposal:

The City of Shoreline proposes to change the street classification of Richmond Beach Drive NW between approximately NW 199th Street and the Snohomish County line from Collector Arterial to Local Street.

The City has issued a SEPA Determination of Non-significance (DNS). This Determination of Nonsignificance (DNS) is issued in accordance with WAC 197-11-340(2).

This may be your only opportunity to submit written comments, including comments on the environmental impacts of the proposal. Written comments must be received at the address listed below before **5:00 p.m. January 19, 2011**. Please mail, fax (206) 801-2788 or deliver comments to the City of Shoreline, Attn: Steven Szafran, AICP 17500 Midvale Avenue North, Shoreline, WA 98133 or email to sszafran@shorelinewa.gov. Upon request, a copy of the final threshold determination for this proposal may be obtained together with the City Council decision on the proposal.

Interested persons are encouraged to provide oral and/or written comments regarding the above project at an open record public hearing. The hearing is scheduled for Thursday January 20, 2011 at 7:00 pm at the City Hall, 17500 Midvale Avenue North.

Copies of the proposal, SEPA Checklist and applicable codes are available for review at the City Hall, 17500 Midvale Avenue North.

Questions or More Information: Please contact Steven Szafran, Planning and Development Services at (206) 801-2512.

Any person requiring a disability accommodation should contact the City Clerk at (206) 801-2230 in advance for more information. For TTY telephone service call (206) 546-0457. Each request will be considered individually according to the type of request, the availability of resources, and the financial ability of the City to provide the requested services or equipment.

This page intentionally blank



Planning and Development Services

STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (SEPA) ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Purpose of Checklist:

The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), chapter 43.21C RCW, requires all governmental agencies to consider the environmental impacts of a proposal before making decisions. An environmental impact statement (EIS) must be prepared for all proposals with probable significant adverse impacts on the quality of the environment. The purpose of this checklist is to provide information to help you and the agency identify impacts from your proposal (and to reduce or avoid impacts from the proposal, if it can be done) and to help the agency decide whether an EIS is required.

Instructions for Applicants:

This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Governmental agencies use this checklist to determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant, requiring preparation of an EIS. Answer the questions briefly, with the most precise information known, or give the best description you can.

You must answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. In most cases, you should be able to answer the questions from your own observations or project plans without the need to hire experts. If you really do not know the answer, or if a question does not apply to your proposal, write "do not know" or "does not apply". Complete answers to the questions now may avoid unnecessary delays later.

Some questions ask about governmental regulations, such as zoning, shoreline, and landmark designations. Answer these questions if you can. If you have problems, the governmental agencies can assist you.

The checklist questions apply to all parts of your proposal, even if you plan to do them over a period of time or on different parcels of land. Attach any additional information that will help describe your proposal or its environmental effects. The agency to which you submit this checklist may ask you to explain your answers or provide additional information reasonably related to determining if there may be significant adverse impact.

Public notice is required for all projects reviewed under SEPA. Please submit current Assessor's Maps/Mailing Labels showing:

- Subject property outlined in red.
- Adjoining properties under the same ownership outlined in yellow.
- All properties within 500' of the subject property, with mailing labels for each owner.

NOTE: King County no longer provides mailing label services. Planning and Development Services can provide this for a fee or provide you instructions on how to obtain this information and create a mail merge document to produce two sets of mailing labels for your application.

Use of Checklist for nonproject proposals:

Complete this checklist for nonproject proposals, even though questions may be answered "does not apply". IN ADDITION complete the SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS (part D).

For nonproject actions, the references in the checklist to the words "project," "applicant," and "property or site" should be read as "proposal," "propose," and "affected geographic area," respectively.

Part Eleven – 197-11-960

SEPA Rules

**TO BE COMPLETED
BY APPLICANT**

**EVALUATION FOR
AGENCY USE ONLY**

A. BACKGROUND

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:
Richmond Beach Road Reclassification
2. Name of applicant:
City of Shoreline
3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person:
Steven Szafran, AICP
206-801-2512
sszafran@shorelinewa.gov
4. Date checklist prepared:
December 14, 2010
5. Agency requesting checklist:
City of Shoreline
6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable):
Planning Commission Study Session-January 6
Planning Commission Public Hearing-January 20
City Council Action-February 2011
7. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain.
See Point Wells Subarea Plan
8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal.
Point Wells EIS

Part Eleven – 197-11-960**SEPA Rules****TO BE COMPLETED
BY APPLICANT****EVALUATION FOR
AGENCY USE ONLY**

9. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain.
Future development of Point Wells

10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known.
does not apply

11. Give a brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page. (Lead agencies may modify this form to include additional specific information on project description).
The City of Shoreline proposes to change the street classification of Richmond Beach Road between approximately NW 199th Street and the county line from Collector Arterial to Local Street.

12. Location of the proposal. Give sufficient information for a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section, township, and range, if known. If a proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographic map if reasonably available. While you should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit applications related to this checklist.
Richmond Beach Road between NW 199th Street and the county line.

Part Eleven – 197-11-960

SEPA Rules

TO BE COMPLETED
BY APPLICANTEVALUATION FOR
AGENCY USE ONLY

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

1. Earth:

- a. General description of the site (circle one): Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous, other: _____
- b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent of slope).
does not apply
- c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any prime farmland.
does not apply
- d. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so describe.
does not apply
- e. Describe the purpose, type and approximate quantities of any filling or grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.
does not apply
- f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing construction or use? If so generally describe.
does not apply
- g. About what percent of the site will be covered with hardscape after project construction (for example asphalt or buildings)?
does not apply
- h. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion , or other impacts to the earth, if any:
does not apply

1/2010

Part Eleven – 197-11-960

SEPA Rules

TO BE COMPLETED
BY APPLICANTEVALUATION FOR
AGENCY USE ONLY

2. Air:

- a. What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal (i.e. dust, automobile, odors, industrial, wood smoke) during construction and when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.

Air emissions will not change from their current levels. Since Local Streets are designed to carry less cars than Collector Arterial streets, future air emissions will be less.

- b. Are there any off site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe.
does not apply
- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air if any:
does not apply

3. Water:

a. Surface:

1. Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into.
This portion of Richmond Beach Road runs parallel to the Puget Sound. This street itself will not be changed
2. Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200') of the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.
does not apply
3. Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill material.
does not apply

Part Eleven – 197-11-960

SEPA Rules

**TO BE COMPLETED
BY APPLICANT**

**EVALUATION FOR
AGENCY USE ONLY**

4. Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities, if known.
does not apply
5. Does the proposal lie within a 100 year floodplain? If so, note location on the site plan.
does not apply
6. Does the proposal involve any discharges of waste materials to surface waters? If so describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.
does not apply
- b. **Ground:**
 1. Will ground water be withdrawn or will water be discharged to ground water? Give general description, purpose and approximate quantities if known.
does not apply
 2. Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any (for example: Domestic sewage; industrial, containing the following chemicals ...; agricultural; etc.). Describe the general size of the system, the number of such systems, the number of houses to be served (if applicable), or the number of animals or humans the system(s) are expected to serve.
does not apply

Part Eleven – 197-11-960

SEPA Rules

TO BE COMPLETED
BY APPLICANTEVALUATION FOR
AGENCY USE ONLYc. **Water Runoff (including storm water):**

1. Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection and disposal, if any (include quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.
does not apply

2. Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe.
does not apply

3. Proposed measures to reduce or control surface ground and runoff water impacts, if any:
does not apply

4. **Plants:**

- a. Check or circle types of vegetation found on the site:

- ☐ deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other
- ☐ evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other
- ☐ shrubs
- ☐ grass
- ☐ pasture
- ☐ crop or grain
- ☐ wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bullrush, skunk cabbage, other
- ☐ water plants: water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other
- ☐ other types of vegetation

Does not
Apply

- b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered?
does not apply

- c. List threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.
does not apply

Part Eleven – 197-11-960

SEPA Rules

**TO BE COMPLETED
BY APPLICANT****EVALUATION FOR
AGENCY USE ONLY**

- d. Proposed landscaping use of native plants or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site if any:
does not apply

5. Animals:

- a. Mark all boxes of any birds and animals which have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site:

Birds: ☐hawk, ☐heron, ☐eagle, ☐songbirds, other: Does not

Mammals: ☐deer, ☐bear, ☐elk, ☐beaver, other: Any

Fish: ☐bass, ☐salmon, ☐trout, ☐herring, ☐shellfish, other: _____

- b. List any threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.

does not apply

- c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so explain.
does not apply

- d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife if any:
does not apply

6. Energy and Natural Resources:

- a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project's energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc

does not apply

- b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe.

does not apply

Part Eleven – 197-11-960

SEPA Rules

**TO BE COMPLETED
BY APPLICANT****EVALUATION FOR
AGENCY USE ONLY**

- c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts if any:
does not apply

7. Environmental Health:

- a. Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste that could occur a result of this proposal? If so describe.
does not apply

1. Describe special emergency services that might be required.
does not apply

2. Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any:
does not apply

b. Noise:

1. What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example: traffic, equipment, operation, other)?
does not apply
2. What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or a long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)? Indicate what hours noise would come from the site.
does not apply
3. Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any:
does not apply

Part Eleven – 197-11-960

SEPA Rules

TO BE COMPLETED
BY APPLICANTEVALUATION FOR
AGENCY USE ONLY

8. Land and Shoreline Use:

- a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties?
This section of Richmond Beach Road serves as access to a number of residential properties in the northwestern portion of the city. The road past the northern boundary of the city passes through the town of Woodway then to Point Wells within unincorporated Snohomish County.
- b. Has the site been used for agriculture? If so, describe
does not apply
- c. Describe any structures on the site.
does not apply
- d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, what?
does not apply
- e. What is the current zoning classification of the site?
does not apply
- f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site?
Collector Arterial Street
- g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?
does not apply
- h. Has any part of the site been classified as an “environmentally sensitive” area? If so, please specify.
does not apply
- i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?
does not apply
- j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?
does not apply

1/2010

Part Eleven – 197-11-960

SEPA Rules

**TO BE COMPLETED
BY APPLICANT****EVALUATION FOR
AGENCY USE ONLY**

- k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any:
does not apply

- l. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any:
The Local Street designation is more compatible with the Comprehensive Plan (rather than Collector Arterial) as vehicle trips assigned to this section of roadway are in the local street numbers (up to 4000 trips per day).

- 9. **Housing:**
 - a. Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle, or low income housing.
does not apply

 - b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high, middle, or low income housing.
does not apply

 - c. Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts if any:
does not apply

- 10. **Aesthetics:**
 - a. What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not including antennas; what is the principal exterior building material(s) proposed?
does not apply

 - b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?
does not apply

Part Eleven – 197-11-960

SEPA Rules

**TO BE COMPLETED
BY APPLICANT**

**EVALUATION FOR
AGENCY USE ONLY**

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any:
does not apply

11. Light and Glare:

- a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur?
does not apply
- b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views?
does not apply
- c. What existing off site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?
does not apply
- d. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts if any:
does not apply

12. Recreation:

- a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?
does not apply
- b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, please describe.
does not apply

Part Eleven – 197-11-960

SEPA Rules

**TO BE COMPLETED
BY APPLICANT****EVALUATION FOR
AGENCY USE ONLY**

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant if any:
does not apply
- 13. Historic and Cultural Preservation:**
- a. Are there any places or objects listed on or proposed for national, state or local preservation registers known to be on or next to the site? If so, generally describe.
does not apply
- b. Generally describe any landmarks or evidence of historic, archaeological, scientific or cultural importance known to be on or next to the site.
does not apply
- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts, if any:
does not apply
- 14. Transportation:**
- a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any:
does not apply
- b. Is site currently served by public transit? If not what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?
This portion of Richmond Beach Road is not served by public transportation.
- c. How many parking spaces would the completed project have? How many would the project eliminate?
does not apply

Part Eleven – 197-11-960

SEPA Rules

TO BE COMPLETED
BY APPLICANTEVALUATION FOR
AGENCY USE ONLY

- d. Will the proposal require any new roads, streets or improvements to existing roads or streets not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private).
does not apply
- e. Will the project use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe.
does not apply
- f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur.
does not apply
- g. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts if any:
does not apply
- 15. Public Services:**
- a. Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: fire protection, police protection, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally describe.
does not apply
- b. Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any.
does not apply
- 16. Utilities:**
- a. Mark all boxes of utilities currently available at the site: *Does not Apply*
☐ electricity, ☐ natural gas, ☐ water, ☐ refuse service,
☐ telephone, ☐ sanitary sewer, ☐ septic system, other: _____

Part Eleven – 197-11-960

SEPA Rules

TO BE COMPLETED
BY APPLICANTEVALUATION FOR
AGENCY USE ONLY

- b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service, and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity that might be needed.

____ Does not Apply

c. SIGNATURE


The above answers are true and complete to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the lead agency is relying on them to make its decision.

Signature: _____

Printed Name: _____

Address _____

Telephone Number: _____

Signature: 
Printed Name: STEVEN SZAPPAN
Address 17500 MIDVALE AVE N. SHORELINE, WA 98133
Telephone Number: (206) 801 2512 Date Submitted December 13, 2010

This page left intentionally blank

Part Eleven – 197-11-960

SEPA Rules

TO BE COMPLETED
BY APPLICANTEVALUATION FOR
AGENCY USE ONLY**D. SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS
(DO NOT USE THIS SHEET FOR PROJECT ACTIONS)**

Because these questions are very general, it may be helpful to read them in conjunction with the list of the elements of the environment.

When answering these questions, be aware of the extent of the proposal, or the types of activities likely to result from the proposal, would affect the item at a greater intensity or at a faster rate than if the proposal were not implemented. Respond briefly and in general terms.

1. How would the proposal be likely to increase discharge to water/emissions to air/production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise?

The reclassification of Richmond Beach Road would likely decrease impacts to the surrounding community. The Local Street designation is the least significant street designation in the City of Shoreline. Total vehicle trips are less than currently allowed under the Collector Arterial designation.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:
does not apply

2. How would the proposal be likely to affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life?

The proposal would not be likely to affect plants, animals, fish or marine life. The Amendment is reclassifying a street on the City's Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map and will not be physically changing in any way.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve plants, animals, fish, or marine life are:
does not apply

1/2010

Part Eleven – 197-11-960

SEPA Rules

**TO BE COMPLETED
BY APPLICANT**

**EVALUATION FOR
AGENCY USE ONLY**

3. How would the proposal be likely to deplete energy or natural resources?
This amendment will not deplete energy or natural resources.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve energy and natural resources are:
does not apply

4. How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection; such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, or prime farmlands?
This amendment will not affect environmentally sensitive areas, parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species, habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, or farmland.

Proposed measures to protect such resources or to avoid or reduce impacts are:
does not apply

5. How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow or encourage land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans?
This amendment will not affect land and shoreline use.

Part Eleven - 197-11-960

SEPA Rules

**TO BE COMPLETED
BY APPLICANT**

**EVALUATION FOR
AGENCY USE ONLY**

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce shoreline and land use impacts are:

does not apply

6. How would the proposal be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities?

The amendment will likely lesson demands on the transportation infrastructure in this area of the City. The Local Street designation is designed to move less cars than the current designation of Collector Arterial.

Proposed measures to reduce or respond to such demands(s) are:

does not apply

7. Identify, if possible, whether the proposal may conflict with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.

This amendment does not conflict with local, state, or federal laws or rquirements for the protection of the environment.

This page intentionally blank



Please join us at the Point Wells Urban Center Pre-Application Neighborhood Meeting

Thursday, January 27, 2011, at the
Shoreline Conference Center Auditorium
Doors open at 6 PM, program starts at 6:30 PM

BSRE Point Wells LP, the owner of the Richmond Beach Asphalt Plant and Marine Fuel Terminal property at Point Wells shown above, is proposing a transformation of this industrial site into the Point Wells Urban Center*, a showcase of sustainable mixed-use residential development, including up to 3500 housing units, restored natural habitats, LEED-certified sustainable architecture, open space for the public, restored beach access and transit-friendly features.

* Project working name

Attachment/Exhibit #9 PRESENTATION CONTENT

Per the Urban Center Development Code,* we will present the following:

- **Conceptual** graphic presentation depicting the **layout and design** of the proposed Point Wells development
- **Size** of the proposed development
- Proposed **mix** of land uses including the number of dwelling units and the amount of non-residential square footage
- Proposed building **heights** and **FAR****
- Number of **parking** spaces
- Location and amount of **open space**

In addition, our presentations will include:

- Conceptual **landscape** and **habitat restoration plans**
- Planned **remediation** of the site
- Conceptual **sustainability** features
- **Public use** features and amenities planned, including parks, pier, boardwalk, amphitheater, waterfront and beach, retail shops and restaurants
- **Traffic** analyses and planning **to-date**, and next steps
- **Transit**-friendly features

What comes **NEXT**, both near term and in the eventual **Environmental Impact Statement [EIS] Process** :

- Developed **architectural** and **landscape** designs
- Additional **traffic analyses** with proposed road design and traffic mitigation concepts
- The EIS is a **1 to 2 year process**, with **more public input** and opportunities for comment, including required public hearings.

* Urban Center Development Code section 30.34A.165 (3)(e)

** FAR, Floor Area Ratio, is the ratio of the total floor area of buildings on a certain location to the size of the land

PointWells

20555 Richmond Beach Dr. NW
Seattle, WA 98177

Project contact:

Mark Wells (206) 724-0828

info@pointwells.com

www.pointwells.com

Meeting Format


PowerPoint presentations (about 60 minutes) will be followed by a moderated question and answer session with key team members

Presentations

Shraga Biran, [video of] the owners' vision
Peter Busby, Perkins + Will Architecture
Peter Walker, Landscape Architecture
Victor Salemann, DEA Traffic Engineering

Followed by a moderated panel with

Peter Busby — Architecture
Peter Walker — Landscape
Victor Salemann — Traffic
Gary Huff — Land Use Attorney/ Process
BSRE Point Wells LP Representative



How to have questions answered at the meeting:

- We will take questions in advance online, at www.pointwells.com/contact-us/ and at the event submitted in writing to the moderator.
- The moderator will conduct the Q&A and the panel will remain until all questions are answered.

How to comment:

- We will take written comments both at the meeting and online, at www.pointwells.com/contact-us/.
- These comments will be summarized and provided to Snohomish County as part of the Urban Center Development Application.

Jessica Simulcik Smith

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 04, 2011 2:15 PM
To: Plancom
Subject: Point Wells

City of Shoreline Planning Commission

Chair Michelle Linders Wagner

Vice Chair Ben Perkowski

Commissioner John Behrens

Commissioner Michael Broili

Commissioner Cynthia Esselman

Commissioner Janne Kaje

Commissioner Donna Moss

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing you on behalf of my parents who reside on Richmond Beach Drive in Shoreline. We have been concerned with the scope of development proposed by the owners of Point Wells and have attended several meetings and hearings as well as drafted numerous letters expressing our concern over the drastic impact the development would have on the Richmond Beach Community.

I wholeheartedly support the city's amendment to reclassify Richmond Beach Drive to *residential neighborhood access*. This clearly makes sense as this is a narrow dead end street.

Most of the discussion I have heard from the developer and Snohomish County focused on the traffic impacts on Richmond Beach Road to 185th and highway 99. Yes, this is the longest stretch between the community and Highway 99, but the greater issue here is indeed Richmond Beach Drive. 100% of the increase in traffic from the proposed development will emanate from the dead end of this narrow two-lane street – the location of Point Wells. Nothing other than unrealistic solutions like “water taxis” and a nonexistent train station have been offered as a means to accommodate the traffic from their proposed oversized development of over 3000+ condos and retail center.

If there were a need for evacuation due to fire or any type of heightened emergency, Richmond Beach Drive would clearly bottleneck, severely limiting access to emergency services and trapping both new and existing

residents in a massive traffic jam since there are no other options for egress. Even a simple collision would do the same!

Richmond Beach *is* residential. Snohomish County may have designated Point Wells as an "Urban Center", yet there is nothing realistically *urban* about Richmond Beach and given that Richmond Beach Drive provides the *only* way to access the site, there is certainly not the transportation infrastructure to support this type of development.

Without a substantive and realistic solution (i.e. another primary road), Richmond Beach Drive should remain classified as neighborhood residential access with no more than 4000 trips per day. For the safety of the residents of Richmond Beach, I ask that you support this amendment and keep the traffic limits on this street to a level befitting its residential location.

Sincerely,

Jan Bakken

Jan O. Bakken

[REDACTED]
Edmonds, Washington 98020
[REDACTED]

Jessica Simulcik Smith

From: Tom Mailhot [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 06, 2011 11:45 PM
To: Plancom; City Council
Subject: Proposal to reclassify Richmond Beach Drive as a residential street

Dear Shoreline City Council and Planning Commission,

As a 25 year resident in the area I am very concerned with the size of the development proposed by the owners of Point Wells. An urban center scaled development at Point Wells would have severe impacts on the Richmond Beach, Richmond Highlands, Innis Arden and Woodway communities.

I fully support the city's amendment to reclassify Richmond Beach Drive to *residential neighborhood access*.

Most of the discussion I have heard from the developer and Snohomish County focused on the traffic impacts on Richmond Beach *Road* to 185th and highway 99. Those are important issues as well but the most critical issue here is the impact on Richmond Beach Drive since 100% of the traffic from the proposed development will have to travel over this narrow two-lane street.

In the event of evacuation due to earthquake or fire or any type of heightened emergency, Richmond Beach Drive would clearly bottleneck, severely limiting access to emergency services and trapping both new and existing residents in a massive traffic jam since there are no other options for leaving the site. Even a simple one-car collision would do the same!

All of the surrounding neighborhoods are residential and Point Wells is miles from the nearest state route. Snohomish County may have designated Point Wells as an "Urban Center", yet there is nothing realistically *urban* about Richmond Beach and Woodway. Richmond Beach Drive provides the only access to the site and it is certainly not the transportation infrastructure needed to support an Urban Center development.

Richmond Beach Drive should be reclassified as neighborhood residential access with no more than 4000 vehicle trips per day. For the safety of the residents of our community, I ask that you support this amendment and keep the traffic limits on this street to a level befitting its residential location.

Sincerely,

Tom Mailhot
[REDACTED]

Shoreline

Jessica Simulcik Smith

From: Lin Felton [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 10, 2011 6:08 PM
To: Keith McGlashan; Will Hall; Chris Eggen; Chris Roberts; Terry Scott; Shari Winstead; Plancom
Subject: Amendment to classify Richmond Beach Drive as "Neighborhood Local Access"
Importance: High

Greetings to all!

I submitted my opinion to Point Wells Development organization (via their site <http://www.pointwells.com/>). I would like you to have a copy of what I submitted. We have been waited for a long time for the development org, Shoreline, Snohomish county and Town of Woodway to come up some plan for us to work with and agree upon. Until today, we haven't see any plan; but there are plans for architecture and landscape, etc. a little disappointed.

Today, I saw the flyer regarding the amendment to classify Richmond Beach Drive as "Neighborhood Local Access". So here I am, pleading for some kind of help from City of Shoreline.

Thanks, ~Lin

We haven't been able to attend any of the meetings WRT Point Wells development planning. However, we're keeping up by reading the materials that sent to us. One thing we care about is the road access solution for us to get in/out of our home.

All of us are aware there will be problem with the traffic, especially if there is any natural disaster happens, 3500-7000 residents, plus the current residents that live on this Richmond Beach Drive will not be able to get out easily.

We're already having issues with getting out of our private road to turn on to Richmond Beach Drive. I can't imagine what will be like in our future. Picture this for a normal morning commute after 3500 residence units are filled with occupants:

- 3500 – 7000 cars (if each unit owns two cars) are driving out of Point Wells zone on Richmond Beach Drive to go to work between 6 – 9AM

- Not very many drivers will stop for letting any current residents out of their drive way or private road on to RB Drive, because by law, they don't have to yield and it's impossible to install traffic lights for every single drive way

- So all of current residents will suffer for the delay or taking risk to get into some type of accident

- Students - parents will be paranoid to allow kids standing by the narrow street with busy traffic to wait for the bus

- You might be able to widen the road, but this won't resolve the following issues which mentioned above too:

- o RB residents will have tremendous amount difficulties to be able to turn on to RB Drive
- o Safety for the school children
- o Only ONE access road for all Point Wells, Woodway and Richmond Beach residents

§ To have only ONE road for all of us residents to use as their only way in/out of their home, not to mention that there will be shopping center and Movie Theater which will only increase the traffic flow. This is not a feasible option.

Do you know that Richmond Beach Road is also only the main exit for majority of RB residents?

§ RB / Shoreline should and is allowing access from Point Wells

§ However, the Town of Woodway will have to allow a street to be built for secondary traffic flow. Especially the Point Wells land is in the Snohomish County. It's a reasonable request for Town of Woodway.

- o Who will be responsible for the maintenance of the RB Drive – Snohomish County, Shoreline, King County

I am not object to Point Wells plan, but the beautiful architecture and landscapes will not resolve the road access problem.

Sincerely,

Lin Felton

Steve Szafran

From: William Rothman [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 11, 2011 8:14 AM
To: Steve Szafran; Steve Cohn
Subject: Street Reclassification

Hi Steve,

As a resident of the City of Shoreline I FULLY SUPPORT the Planning Commission's proposal to change the street classification of Richmond Beach Drive NW.

However, I have a question about the section "between NW 199th Street and the Snohomish County Line". In reality, the only section of Richmond Beach Drive NW that is arterial is the "loop" between NW 196th Street and NW 195th Place.

I have a suggestion that I think makes more sense, and that will stand a better chance of being upheld against future legal challenges...

IDENTIFY THE STREETS, AND SECTIONS OF STREETS, THAT MAKE UP THE COLLECTOR ARTERIAL, AND EXCLUDE ALL OTHER ADJACENT STREETS, AND SECTIONS OF STREETS, FROM BEING PART OF THE ARTERIAL.

There are two advantages to this approach:

1. The Planning Commission won't have to make multiple proposals to reclassify other streets, or sections of streets, should the need arise.
2. It doesn't have the obvious appearance of specifically targeting the Wells Point development project.

Let me know what you think. Thanks you for your effort!

William R. Rothman
[REDACTED]
Shoreline, WA 98177

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

--
Bill Rothman
VES Company, Inc.
[REDACTED]
Shoreline, WA 98177

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Jessica Simulcik Smith

From: Ken and Pearl Noreen [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, January 12, 2011 3:35 PM
To: Plancom
Subject: Point Wells

[REDACTED]
Shoreline, Washington 98177
[REDACTED]

January 12, 2011

Dear Planning Commissioners: Chr. Michelle Wagner, Ben Perkowski, John Behrens, Michael Broili, Cunthia Esselman, Janne Kaje, and Donna Moss,

Ken and I have lived in Richmond Beach for 43 years and have used Richmond Beach Drive for our daily access to the community. We strongly urge the Planning Commission and the City Council to support the amendment to classify Richmond Beach Drive as a neighborhood local access street. With the Point Wells Development it seems like this is the only logical solution to limit the number of daily car trips on the drive. Otherwise we may not be able to get out of our driveway for our own daily access.

Sincerely,

Ken and Pearl Noreen

Jessica Simulcik Smith

From: Deborah Bowen-Mills [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 13, 2011 11:43 AM
To: Plancom; City Council
Subject: Voter at Richmond Beach neighborhood

To Council, I have lived in Richmond Beach and have raised my children here way before we were even the city of Shoreline. I have been very active in my neighborhood and served on the board here. Now that we are up against this BIG plan to change Point Wells, I need to let you know that I am VERY apposed the this plan building of 3,500. condo or less. Oh yes you can say that there will be a marina and a board walk and nice shops, BUT WE DO NOT NEED THIS! Our property taxes keep going up and our land value keeps going down. This development will only make Richmond Beach a over populated place to live. Really I have been to the close door meetings with Bob Olander and the RB board and you are kidding yourself if you think our road can be the access to this new proposition. This would change EVERYTHING we love about living in Richmond Beach. The road is busier then when I first moved here 25 years ago. How can you possibly think that this new development will help us? We have less then 5,000. residents in RB. I cannot see at least 7,000. more people and probably twice as many cars. We will not stop trying to stop this, even if Shoreline gets what they want, the monies for our fire dept, police, utilities. Hey we loss when we did not get this in our county. We cannot win at this no matter how much money you all think we will get. If this is to happen we need a CLOSED OFF ACCESS TO RICHMOND BEACH! I know I will be down there with my picket signs saying HELL NO!, Sincerely, Deborah Bowen-Mills

Jessica Simulcik Smith

From: Michael Friedline [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 13, 2011 12:17 PM
To: City Council; Plancom
Subject: Thank you for reclassifying Richmond Beach road!

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Since hearing about the proposed Point Wells development, I have been very concerned about the impact to the neighborhoods in Richmond Beach, Innis Arden, and west Shoreline. I could not imagine how Richmond Beach road would realistically accommodate the additional traffic caused by even 2500 new residences and other businesses. The road in front of my house would also be impacted negatively.

Thank you for agreeing to reclassify Richmond Beach Road to "neighborhood local access" and therefore limiting growth options to those that will keep the daily traffic level at 4,000 vehicles or less. With only one road for the resulting traffic, and the fact that it is a narrow dead-end with no sidewalks and several miles from the nearest state route or highway this makes very good and reasonable sense. I appreciate that the City is listening to the residents living in this area and cares for our safety and quality of life. I know that the incentive to find new revenues often exerts more influence than preserving ambience, beauty, and quality of life. However, cities thrive when their residents are proud to live there and feel their needs are heard.

Please count me as one more vote for Shoreline to determine its own fate with regard to the Point Wells expansion plans in Snohomish County.

Michael Friedline

Michael Friedline

[REDACTED]

Shoreline, WA, 98177

[REDACTED] direct line

Jessica Simulcik Smith

From: Sonja Cassen [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 13, 2011 12:45 PM

Dear Shoreline City Council and Planning Commission,

As a resident in the area I have been increasingly concerned with the scope of the development proposed by the owners of Point Wells. The drastic impacts of an urban center scaled development would have severe and irrevocable impacts on the Richmond Beach, Richmond Highlands, Innis Arden and Woodway communities.

I wholeheartedly support the city's amendment to reclassify Richmond Beach Drive to *residential neighborhood access*. This clearly makes sense as this is a narrow dead end street.

Most of the discussion I have heard from the developer and Snohomish County focused on the traffic impacts on Richmond Beach Road to 185th and highway 99. The greater issue here is Richmond Beach Drive. 100% of the increase in traffic from the proposed development will emanate from the dead end of this narrow two-lane street – the location of Point Wells.

If there were a need for evacuation due to earthquake or fire or any type of heightened emergency, Richmond Beach Drive would clearly bottleneck, severely limiting access to emergency services and trapping both new and existing residents in a massive traffic jam since there are no other options for egress. Even a simple one-car collision would do the same!

All of the surrounding neighborhoods are residential and Point Wells is miles from the nearest state route. Snohomish County may have designated Point Wells as an "Urban Center", yet there is nothing realistically *urban* about Richmond Beach and Woodway. Given that Richmond Beach Drive provides the only way to access the site, there is certainly not the transportation infrastructure or access to support this type of development.

Without a substantive and realistic solution (i.e. another primary road), Richmond Beach Drive should remain classified as neighborhood residential access with no more than 4000 vehicle trips per day. For the safety of the residents of our community, I ask that you support this amendment and keep the traffic limits on this street to a level befitting its residential location.

Sincerely,

Sonja Cassen

Jessica Simulcik Smith

From: Renee Ostrem [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 13, 2011 12:55 PM
To: Plancom; City Council
Cc: info@saverichmondbeach.org
Subject: Fw: Public Hearing on January 20 | Shoreline to change Richmond Beach Drive to local access

Dear City of Shoreline,

My husband and I are Richmond Beach residents and **SUPPORT** the "proposed amendment to the City's comprehensive plan for the Point Wells subarea that would reclassify the segment of road from 199th to the county line from "collector arterial" to "neighborhood local" access."

Thank you for your support of keeping our neighborhood a neighborhood and not a highway!

Sincerely,
Renee & Kanoa Ostrem
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

--- On Thu, 1/13/11, Save Richmond Beach <info@saverichmondbeach.org> wrote:

From: Save Richmond Beach <info@saverichmondbeach.org>
Subject: Public Hearing on January 20 | Shoreline to change Richmond Beach Drive to local access
To: "Renee" <renee@ostremlaw.com>
Date: Thursday, January 13, 2011, 11:22 AM

Email not displaying correctly? [View it in your browser.](#)



**SAVE
RICHMOND
BEACH**

The City of Shoreline is listening to the people who matter.....the residents!

Shoreline has proposed an amendment to reclassify a segment of Richmond Beach Drive from arterial to neighborhood local access.

The City of Shoreline has heard our concerns about traffic and safety in our neighborhood and is taking action. They have proposed an amendment to the City's comprehensive plan for the Point Wells subarea that would

**CRITICAL MEETING -
PLEASE ATTEND:
Planning commission public
hearing**

January 20 - 7:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers
17500 Midvale Avenue North,
Shoreline

SEND A LETTER:

If you can't attend please send a letter or email supporting the amendment to the Planning Commission and the Shoreline City Council. Make sure the letter is sent

reclassify the segment of road from 199th to the county line from "collector arterial" to "neighborhood local" access. This is important because a neighborhood local road is limited to no more than 4,000 car trips daily, less than half the limit on a collector arterial.

We are pleased and thankful that the City has heard our concerns and is taking appropriate action. However, we still need your help. The City is listening, but they still need to know just how important this change is. Please come to the Planning Commission Public Hearing on **January 20** and let them know that 4,000 is a much more appropriate number than the currently allowed 8,250 in the subarea plan, which according to traffic studies will cause our intersections to fail.

The full text of the proposed policy amendment is provided below. In recognition of the potential for future development at Point Wells, the proposed amendment leaves the door open to an increase in traffic if the developer provides the necessary mitigation.

Policy PW-13

In view of the fact that Richmond Beach Drive between NW 199th St. and NW 205th St. is a dead-end local access road with no opportunities for alternative access to dozens of homes in Shoreline and Woodway, the City designates this as a local access street with a maximum capacity of 4,000 vehicle trips per day. Unless and until either Snohomish County or the owner of the Point Wells Urban Center can provide to the City the Transportation Corridor Study and Mitigation Plan called for in Policy PW-9, as well as financial and legal guarantees that the necessary mitigations will be provided, the City should not consider classifying this road segment as an arterial with a capacity of 8,250 vehicle trips per day.

Come on out and let the City of Shoreline know how you feel about this important

by 4PM on January 20.

*** Email letters to:**

plancom@shorelinewa.gov and
council@shorelinewa.gov

Blue Square Real Estate to host pre-application neighborhood meeting on January 27

BSRE has issued their neighborhood meeting notice, a requirement to submitting a development application to Snohomish County.

Read the meeting notice and mark your calendars for January 27 at 6PM at the Shoreline Conference Center, 18560 1st Avenue NE in the City of Shoreline.

Written questions submitted by the public at the event or in advance at www.pointwells.com/contact-us will be summarized and included in the application submittal to Snohomish County.

issue!

If you agree this is important to quality of life and safety of our neighborhood, here are some of the key points for the Planning Commission and Shoreline City Council:

- Richmond Beach Drive should be classified as local with a maximum number of car trips of 4,000.
- The portion of Richmond Beach Drive that is in Woodway is already local access.
- Richmond Beach Drive is:
 - A narrow, dead-end street with no sidewalks
 - Miles from the nearest state route
 - Presently used for local access
- There is no other access to that road from 199th to County line, so collector arterial is inaccurate designation

To show your support, Save Richmond Beach also suggests sending the City a letter like the one already submitted by one of our neighbors:

"I wholeheartedly support the city's amendment to reclassify Richmond Beach Drive to *residential neighborhood access*. This clearly makes sense as this is a narrow dead end street."
read full letter...

Your comments can be sent to:

City of Shoreline
17500 Midvale Avenue N
Shoreline, WA 98133-4905

Or via email at:
council@shorelinewa.gov
plancom@shorelinewa.gov

SaveRichmondBeach.org is a community-driven non-profit organization dedicated to preserving our neighborhood through

responsible and sustainable planning.

You are receiving this e-mail because you care about preserving Richmond Beach.

Unsubscribe renee@ostremlaw.com from this list.

Our mailing address is:
Save Richmond Beach
PO Box 60191
Richmond Beach, WA 98177

Add us to your address book

Copyright (C) 2009 Save Richmond Beach All rights reserved.

Forward this email to a friend

Update your profile

Jessica Simulcik Smith

From: Greg McCall [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 13, 2011 1:44 PM
To: City Council; Plancom; kcexec@kingcounty.gov; bob.ferguson@kingcounty.gov; larry.phillips@kingcounty.gov; mccrady.melinda@leg.wa.gov; ruth.kagi@leg.wa.gov; Maralyn.Chase@leg.wa.gov
Subject: Point Wells Development

Shoreline City Council and Planning Commission
 King County Council
 King County Executive
 State Legislators

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen:

I have lived in the Richmond Beach neighborhood of Shoreline for over 20 years and am writing to express my deep concern over the scope of development proposed by the owners of Point Wells. I am also shocked at the cavalier attitude Snohomish County has taken up to now with regard to this development, which will directly impact not only my property value, but my quality of life and personal safety, as my property abuts the road that will be directly impacted by the increased traffic planned. The planned urban center scaled development would have severe and irrevocable impacts on the Richmond Beach, Richmond Highlands, Innis Arden and Woodway communities. Anything that can be done to slow down, hinder, and reverse the unconscionable actions of Snohomish County should be done.

By this letter, I am confirming that I completely support the city of Shoreline's amendment to reclassify Richmond Beach Drive to *residential neighborhood access*. This clearly makes sense as this is a narrow dead end street.

While the proposed development will have a very negative impact on all of Richmond Beach Road and surrounding side streets all the way to Aurora (and all of it would run by my house), it would have a horrific impact on Richmond Beach Drive. All of the increase in traffic from the proposed development will emanate from the dead end of this narrow two-lane street – the location of Point Wells.

Any kind of emergency would cause a significant bottleneck on Richmond Beach Drive, severely limiting access to emergency services and trapping both new and existing residents in a massive traffic jam since there are no other options for egress. Already now, there seems to be on average one or two emergency vehicles going down Richmond Beach Road every night, sirens blazing (Richmond Beach Rehab Center?)

All of the surrounding neighborhoods are residential and Point Wells is miles from the nearest state route. Snohomish County may have designated Point Wells as an "Urban Center," yet there is nothing even remotely urban about Richmond Beach and Woodway. This designation simply does not pass the smell test. Given that Richmond Beach Drive provides the only way to access the site, there is certainly not the transportation infrastructure or access to support this type of development. Perhaps the development can have ferry access so as not to impact the surrounding neighborhood.

It is not fair to existing residents of the area to have a developer make millions of dollars at their expense. Richmond Beach Drive should remain classified as neighborhood residential access with no more than 4000 vehicle trips per day. Even that number makes Richmond Beach Road seem like a freeway at times. For the safety and well being of the residents of our community, I ask that you support this amendment and keep the

traffic limits on this street to a level befitting its residential location. I urge you to investigate and oppose Snohomish County's patently illogical and illegal designation of Point Wells as an Urban Center.

Sincerely,

Gregory K. McCall

[REDACTED]
Shoreline, WA 98177
[REDACTED]

Jessica Simulcik Smith

From: M &/or S Ryan [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 13, 2011 2:20 PM
To: City Council; Plancom
Cc: info@saverichmondbeach.org
Subject: Reclassify Richmond Beach Drive from arterial to neighborhood local access.

Dear Shoreline City Council Members and Planning Commissioners,

I strongly support the amendment to classify a segment of Richmond Beach Drive from arterial to neighborhood local access.

I believe that if the Point Wells property is to be developed as per the zoning rules of Snohomish County then the access should be through Snohomish county and paid for by Snohomish county.

From the beginning, suggestions for alternate access routes through Snohomish County were dismissed out of hand.

The county then modified their growth plan to reclassify the area as an Urban Center to allow the developer the to proceed.

This whole situation is an abuse of the Growth management Act which has the stated intent of accommodating increased population while preserving the quality of life in all neighborhoods.

If the development proceeds as planned, the increase in traffic will most certainly degrade the quality of life for our neighborhood.

For perspective, 4,000 trips per day (12 hr useful time) = 5-6 cars per minute in an 12 hr period.

I don't want to see what changes 10 - 12 cars per hr would bring.

Thank you for listening and protecting our neighborhood from this abuse.

Mark & Sherri Ryan

[REDACTED]

Richmond Beach, WA 98177

[REDACTED]

Jessica Simulcik Smith

From: Tom Petersen & Michelle Hillyer [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 13, 2011 2:38 PM
To: Plancom
Subject: Richmond Beach Drive

Dear Shoreline City Council and Planning Commission,

As a Richmond Beach resident I am very concerned about the development proposed by the owners of Point Wells. An urban-center-scaled development would have severe and irrevocable impacts on the Richmond Beach, Richmond Highlands, Innis Arden and Woodway communities.

I wholeheartedly support the city's amendment to reclassify Richmond Beach Drive as *residential neighborhood access*. This clearly makes sense as this is a narrow dead-end street.

While most of the discussion has focused on the traffic impacts on Richmond Beach *Road* to 185th and Highway 99, the greater issue here is Richmond Beach Drive. 100% of the increase in traffic from the proposed development will travel to and from the dead end of this narrow two-lane street – the location of Point Wells.

If there were a need for evacuation due to earthquake or fire or any type of heightened emergency, Richmond Beach Drive would clearly become a bottleneck, severely limiting access to emergency services and trapping both new and existing residents, as well as emergency responders, in a massive traffic jam, since there are no other options for egress. Even a simple one-car collision would do the same!

All of the neighborhoods surrounding Point Wells are residential, and Point Wells is miles from the nearest highway. Snohomish County may have designated Point Wells as an "Urban Center", but there is nothing remotely *urban* about Richmond Beach or Woodway. Given that Richmond Beach Drive provides the only way to access Point Wells, there is certainly not the transportation infrastructure or access to support this type of development.

Because of this, Richmond Beach Drive should remain classified as neighborhood residential access with no more than 4000 vehicle trips per day. For the safety of the residents of our community, I ask that you support this amendment and keep the traffic limits on this street to a level befitting its residential location.

Sincerely,

Michelle Hillyer

Steve Szafran

From: Larry and Lori Newman [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 13, 2011 3:59 PM
To: City Council; Plancom; Steve Szafran
Cc: Robert Olander; Keith McGlashan; Will Hall; Chris Eggen; Doris McConnell; Chris Roberts; Terry Scott; Shari Winstead
Subject: Please put our City ahead of Point Wells

Dear Shoreline City Council and Planning Commission, I realize that I am using a template provided by the "Save Richmond Beach"

organization and as such it's doubtful that anyone will actually read my email. It's even less likely that I'll receive a response tailored to my letter but I'll try nonetheless. As a Richmond Highlands neighborhood (180th and 3rd NW) resident I have become greatly concerned with the scope of the development proposed by the owners of Point Wells. The radical impacts of an urban center scaled development would have brutal and irreversible impacts on my neighborhood.

I enthusiastically support the city's amendment to reclassify Richmond Beach Drive to residential neighborhood access. This clearly makes sense as this is a narrow dead end street.

Most of the sales job that I have heard from the developer and Snohomish County have focused on the traffic impacts on Richmond Beach Road to 185th and highway 99. As a resident of Richmond Highlands which will be bisected by what will become a major arterial similar to Aurora I am terribly concerned for the quality of our lifestyle (and housing values). In the 17 years since we moved to this neighborhood from Capitol Hill in Seattle I have watched with dismay at how getting around Shoreline has become increasingly difficult and frustrating. Now I watch with concern as my very neighborhood is threatened with potential bottlenecks, more traffic "control" devices, large commercial vehicles and increasing amounts of buses navigating narrow neighborhood streets. I have been disappointed at the (my perception, perhaps) lack of concern or activity shown by my civic leaders.

In my opinion, Snohomish County has instigated hostile action against my neighborhood and the taxpayers of this city and I am glad that you are now countering their actions.

If there were a need for evacuation due to earthquake or fire or any type of heightened emergency, Richmond Beach Drive would clearly bottleneck, severely limiting access to emergency services and trapping both new and existing residents in a massive traffic jam since there are no other options

for egress. Even a simple one-car collision would do the same!

All of the surrounding neighborhoods are residential and Point Wells is miles from the nearest state route. Snohomish County may have designated Point Wells as an "Urban Center", yet there is nothing realistically urban about Richmond Beach and Woodway. Given that Richmond Beach Drive provides the only way to access the site, there is certainly not the transportation infrastructure or access to support this type of development.

Without a substantive and realistic solution (i.e. another primary road), Richmond Beach Drive should remain classified as neighborhood residential access with no more than 4000 vehicle trips per day. For the safety of the residents of our community and to preserve the peaceful nature of our neighborhoods, I ask that you support this amendment and keep the traffic limits on this street to a level befitting its residential location.

Sincerely,
 Larry Newman
 [REDACTED]

Jessica Simulcik Smith

From: Ginger Botham [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 13, 2011 6:10 PM
To: Plancom; City Council
Subject: Point Wells development & Richmond Beach Road

I fully support the proposal to identify Richmond Beach Road as a NON-arterial. It is a two lane no sidewalk dead end road.

I've followed the Point Wells issue from the beginning and am appalled that a city in a different county can control development in an isolated area not connected by any roads to that city and county.

If Point Wells is going to be developed by Snohomish County then Snohomish County should provide arterials through Snohomish County for that development.

Sincerely,

Virginia Botham
[REDACTED]

Shoreline, WA 98133

Ginger & Ric Botham
[REDACTED]

Almost anyone can stand adversity. To test a person's character, give him or her power.
-Abraham Lincoln

Jessica Simulcik Smith

From: elaine phelps [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 13, 2011 9:01 PM
To: Plancom
Subject: Policy PW-13

We will not be able to attend the hearing on January 20 but would like to go on record to say that we strongly support Policy PW-13 to restrict traffic on Richmond Beach Drive. It is in the public interest to protect our neighborhoods, and this policy will help to do so.

Thank you for your consideration.

Elaine & Robert Phelps

[REDACTED]
Shoreline WA 98177

[REDACTED]

Jessica Simulcik Smith

From: Cathy Martin [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 13, 2011 9:09 PM
To: City Council; Plancom
Subject: Richmond Beach Drive - Classification as Neighborhood Access

I am writing in support of Policy PW-13 that would re-classify Richmond Beach Drive between NW 199th St and NW 205th St as a neighborhood access street as an attempt to limit traffic to the Point Wells proposed development. If the City Council could classify it as an undeveloped dirt road with even more limited traffic, that would be better!

I would also be willing to consider any suggestion to slow traffic on all of Richmond Beach Road if it would mean that Shoreline could prevent the massive development proposed at Point Wells.

The main arterial of Richmond Beach Road couldn't support the proposed influx of cars and it is **preposterous** to think that Richmond Beach Drive could manage any additional traffic. No matter how much I try to think out of the box, I can't fathom how there could be any mitigation that would be able to shoehorn even 4,000 trips per day, much less how many cars would be added from a development that large.

Sincerely,

Cathy Martin

[REDACTED]

Shoreline, WA 98177

Jessica Simulcik Smith

From: Carlton Findley [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 13, 2011 9:27 PM
To: City Council; Plancom
Cc: info@saverichmondbeach.org
Subject: Support for Policy PW-13: reclassify Richmond Beach Drive to residential neighborhood access.

Dear Shoreline City Council and Planning Commission,

I strongly support the reclassification of Richmond Beach Drive to residential neighborhood access.

I moved to Richmond Beach last summer, in large part for the small neighborhood feel and peace and quiet. I remember clearly one sunny day we were looking at houses and walked down 199th Street to a small park off Richmond Beach Drive. It was very quiet and peaceful. This is the kind of neighborhood we should protect and that makes this such a great place for families.

The idea of planting a shopping mall and 3500 condos there is ridiculous. I am hopeful that common sense will prevail, and that the residents will unite and reject this with one voice, and that the leaders of our community will listen and use good judgement.

I fear the resources that a Middle-Eastern billionaire can bring to bear in terms of lawyers, slick marketing, and the sheer power of money to influence processes and governments. This billionaire's interest is in making a huge profit, with no regard for the long-term effects on this community. Once the last condo is sold, the millions in profits will go in his pocket, halfway around the world, and we'll be left with the mess: a gash through our neighborhood where over 8000 cars speed by every day, the homes along the road devalued as home on busy streets always are, noise, pollution, crime. Inevitably these properties will be rezoned for convenience stores and strip malls to serve the condo community. The lower income required for condo residents will bring in a different crowd – not a family crowd, and a market for alcohol and drugs will grow to feed the partiers. This will in turn bring crime and safety issues into our neighborhood. It will definitely lower property values.

I bought in this neighborhood expecting it would remain as it is now for years to come. I oppose all efforts to fabricate an 'urban center' in the middle of it. I very much appreciate your work on this matter and appreciate the significant power you have over the outcome. I know you won't be intimidated by big-bankroll attorneys or swept off your feet by disingenuous businessmen – you have the power to do what's right, for our families and the future.

There are alternatives for access to the Point Wells site. I don't want it there at all, but it is worth pointing out that there are viable alternatives for the kind of access to the site that is needed.

Alternative Access #1: If they need access to the site for a lot of traffic, it makes much more sense to use the existing road that leads north from Point Wells to Edmonds. It parallels the railroad tracks and can be seen from Google Maps. There are vehicles parked along it visible. Here's a link to Google Maps showing a truck parked on the

side. <http://maps.google.com/maps/mm?hl=en&ie=UTF8&ll=47.794366,-122.391378&spn=0.00095,0.001789&t=h&z=19>
I'm sure they have made an effort to obscure its existence. But it makes a lot more sense to go that way.

*The Highway 104 goes all the way from the Edmonds Ferry to I-5. This highway is certainly capable of handling the high volume of traffic required, and it won't impact existing neighborhoods.

*The road would go along the railroad tracks and through the industrial area around the marina to get to 104, very little impact.

*Though the distance might be marginally longer to get to I-5, it would take the same amount of time, as 104 is designed to move a lot of traffic quickly to I-5. The route through RB is through neighborhoods, and even once you get to 99, you must go either north or south to cut over to I-5. Google Maps plots the time/dist from Point Wells to I-5 at 175th at 4.2 miles/12 minutes. From Edmonds Marina it is 4.5 miles/10 minutes. If you add a mile to get to Point Wells along the railroad access road, it would add at most a couple more minutes. Time-wise, which is what really counts, it is arguably the same amount of time going this way to get to I-5.

*Large Condo community already exists in Edmonds, along with all the support services. It makes much more sense to link to this community instead of tearing up RB.

*There is even the 'Transit Center' there that they tout! Both ferry and Sounder rail are there.

*It all remains in Snoho County.

Alternative Access #2: A tunnel was recently built for the Brightwater project right down the county line to the water. A small tunnel could certainly be built to more directly link the site to 104. The developer states they will spend \$1 billion in developing the area – so a tunnel of this nature is certainly in the budget. The entire Brightwater project was only a few billion, and that was for running a tunnel from Woodinville and building treatment plants. The tunnel boring equipment and contractors are certainly available here locally.

I think one of the main reasons the developer wants access through Richmond Beach is the cachet of the neighborhood. This is an old, desirable neighborhood. For the purposes of selling condos, it would be a great thing for the brochures. No matter that it would wreck the nature of the neighborhood to build it here; that is irrelevant to their bottom line. There are reasonable alternatives, and we should not feel as though this is the only way the developer can get access to his land.

Fyi, I have just donated \$100 to Save Richmond Beach, and will continue to support their efforts as long as it takes to protect our neighborhood. Thanks again for your careful consideration of this issue.

Best Regards,

Carlton & Lori Findley

[REDACTED]
Shoreline, WA 98177
[REDACTED]

Jessica Simulcik Smith

From: Karen Briggs, CFP [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 13, 2011 9:58 PM
To: Plancom
Subject: YES! Reclassify richmond beach drive!

Shoreline Planning Commission:

RE: Reclassifying Richmond Beach Drive is crucial

Richmond Beach Drive is NOT Aurora. It is a quite little road into a small neighborhood. So we believe it is CRITICAL that you reclassify Richmond Beach Drive as a neighborhood local access street.

My family has lived on Richmond Beach Drive since 1968. It is absolutely ridiculous to allow more than 4,000 trips per day on this narrow, winding, neighborhood street and still be safe.

We would also like to preserve our quality of life. The alternataive is to have a virutal freeway buzzing past our front door, day and night.

Very truly yours,

Karen Briggs
[REDACTED]
Seattle, WA 98177
[REDACTED]

Jessica Simulcik Smith

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, January 14, 2011 5:46 AM
To: Plancom
Subject: Richmond Beach

I am in complete accord and very supportive of the proposed plan to designate a part of Richmond Beach Road as LOCAL ACCESS.

Go forward and accomplish this goal and you secure my vote.

Thank you!!

Ken Anderson

Jessica Simulcik Smith

From: Sonja Serwold [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, January 14, 2011 7:52 AM
To: Plancom; City Council
Subject: RB drive traffic concerns

Dear City of Shoreline Officials,

We support the proposed ammendment to reclassify Richmond Beach Drive from 199th north to the county line from an arterial to neighborhood local access. I understand this would limit the access to this road to be no more than 4000 trips per day which is a much more appropriate number than the 8000 allowed on an arterial. It truly is a small neighborhood road and should be continued to be used as such.

Thank you for hearing the concerns of the Richmond Beach neighborhood and working to keep Richmond Beach and the whole city of Shoreline a great place to live.

Chris & Sonja Serwold

[REDACTED]
Shoreline, WA 98177

Jessica Simulcik Smith

From: Heather Bentley [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, January 14, 2011 9:29 AM
To: City Council
Subject: support reclassification of Richmond Beach Drive

Dear Shoreline City Council and Planning Commission,

I'm a resident of the Richmond Highlands neighborhood in Shoreline. I am very concerned about the proposed Pt. Wells development, and the huge increases in traffic through Richmond Beach that would result.

I support the city's amendment to reclassify Richmond Beach Drive to *residential neighborhood access*.

Richmond Beach Drive is a narrow two-lane road and cannot handle the excess traffic.

Snohomish County needs to construct its own major arterial within its own boundaries if it is eager to see the residential urban development of Pt. Wells.

The City of Shoreline cannot be turned into an easement for access to its neighbor's plot.

Sincerely,

Heather Bentley
[REDACTED]