POINT WELLS
FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

Below are questions and comments the City has received from the public regarding BSRE's proposed development at Point Wells along with the City's responses. As the process moves forward and new questions and concerns arise, we will add them to this list and provide responses.

LEGAL

1. Who makes the decisions concerning the project and what can be done about it?

Under the current development process, Snohomish County makes all decisions regarding the project size, scale, scope, and issues the permits for the project. By attempting to negotiate a binding agreement with BSRE, we are seeking to restrict the project scale and scope to an extent that the County, through its permit process, is not likely to. If BSRE is willing to bind itself to a smaller development through an agreement with Shoreline, including funding a Transportation Corridor Study and mitigation, and committing to annexing the property to Shoreline at some point in the future, those are good outcomes for the community that are otherwise unlikely through the Snohomish County permitting process.

2. What are the City's options now that the Court of Appeals has found that BSRE's permit application has vested?

Now that the Court of Appeals has found that BSRE's permit application has vested, we have several options.

Enter into an agreement with BSRE

Given that this development is controlled by Snohomish County regulations, the City has focused on influencing the scale of the project and mitigating its impacts by negotiating an agreement with BSRE. Our primary interests have included addressing the increase in traffic, safety concerns of pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists, and the commitment to fund improvements and ongoing maintenance. We believe an agreement will provide residents with a direct role in identifying mitigation and in developing a plan to lessen adverse impacts.

Continue to seek legal challenges

The City could continue to look for ways to fight BSRE's permits for development through the Courts; however, as demonstrated with the recent Court of Appeals decision, leaving the decision to the courts provides no control or certainty over the outcome. Even if we were successful at achieving some legal success, the results would most likely be limited and would not come close to achieving what we can through a negotiated agreement. Before coming to this conclusion, we sought legal advice from Foster Pepper law firm, a state leader in representing municipalities on environmental and land use law. Foster Pepper confirmed our approach that a negotiated agreement with the City would be the best way to protect the community's interests.

Allow mitigation to be determined by Snohomish County

Under Snohomish County's code, BSRE is required to complete a transportation study to anticipate impacts of the development and to identify mitigation to address those impacts through the SEPA process. This is the default course of action that would prevail in the absence of an agreement with

BSRE. Following this process, BSRE would not be required to include public participation opportunities as part of the study. Furthermore, BSRE would not be obligated to negotiate directly with the City of Shoreline for any mitigation. Although we would have an opportunity to comment on the impacts and provide input on what should be considered for mitigation, Snohomish County ultimately would make the final decision on what conditions may or may not apply to the permit.

Below are other options brought up by community members:

Block or substantially restrict access to Point Wells

A suggestion we often hear from residents is to close or block access to Point Wells. Pursuing this approach puts the City at risk of a legal challenge. Such a strategy has been used in Washington State before and was ruled unlawful.

Other traffic control devices, such as speed bumps and traffic circles, are available when required for safe use of the right-of-way by vehicles and pedestrians, and will be considered as options in the contemplated Transportation Corridor Study if roadway safety is not resolved with other mitigation measures. While traffic calming measures like speed bumps and circles are typically used on local streets to manage such issues as speed and cut-through traffic, there is a practical limit if applied to a higher volume street. At some point, the increased time to move through a corridor with such improvements would likely frustrate existing residents along the corridor since it would most likely increase congestion rather than mitigate it. While we do see the use of such devices along the side streets to manage the effects of a Point Wells project, we do not see these tools as being practical along the main corridor.

Create a metropolitan park district

While the City has the legal means to condemn the property for public use as a park, the City must compensate the private property owner at fair market value. In examining what it might cost taxpayers to purchase the property and establish a Metropolitan Park District, we used an estimated value of $50 million repaid over 20 years. It would also require a public vote with at least 60% approval. If the District included all of Shoreline and the Town of Woodway, it would cost the average homeowner in Shoreline approximately $189 and an average homeowner in Woodway $550 annually. To put this in perspective, for the 2006 Parks Bond, the average Shoreline homeowner is paying $70 per year over a 15 year period. We believe this alternative would have many hurdles to overcome.

Maintain Richmond Beach Drive's "local street" classification with 4,000 average daily trips (ADT)

The City's street classification does not provide any limitations for trips or size of development related to the vested Point Wells development. The subarea plan for Point Wells sets a cap of 4000 ADT, but this limit is to be revised once a Transportation Corridor Study (TCS) is completed and funding for the mitigation is committed. Since BSRE is willing to complete the TCS, the City cannot hold to the 4000 ADT.

3. There have been references made to SRB and the Town of Woodway's appeal to the State Supreme Court, and the fact that the City of Shoreline has declined to be a party to this legal action. If the City is not a party to the action, is the City considering filing an amicus brief to show their support for SRB and the Town of Woodway?

The City determined that its best opportunity for influencing the Point Wells development was through negotiation of a mitigation agreement with BSRE and therefore it did not join the appeal of the vested permits filed in superior court by Woodway and SRB. We see no reason to change this course following the Court of Appeals ruling upholding the vested status of the permits under the Growth Management Act, including joining as an amicus. We have been negotiating with BSRE on conducting a transportation corridor study that will have more substantive public input and be more robust than what BSRE is

required to do absent an agreement. Filing an amicus brief against BSRE at this time would terminate negotiations. We still believe reaching a negotiated agreement with BSRE is in the best long-term interest of the community.

4. Will the City refuse to condemn private property to accommodate development?

The Memorandum of Understanding reached between the City and BSRE ensures the typical 60 foot right-of-way width on Richmond Beach Road and Drive will remain the maximum width allowed, except where the study concludes that isolated corners at intersections are necessary to accommodate such improvements as turn lanes, sidewalks or curbing.

It is important to remember that the physical location of the right-of-way (i.e. property lines) relative to the pavement is not easily identified. In many cases residents are probably using the public right-of-way for such uses as landscaping, retaining walls and parking. This is fairly common. These types of improvements would have to be relocated or eliminated in order to accommodate the mitigation within the existing right-of-way. This circumstance is more likely in the Richmond Beach Drive section. The Transportation Corridor Study will include a high level of hands on work with individual properties along Richmond Beach Drive to identify and weigh alternatives/options for improvements along this "tight" stretch of roadway.

AGREEMENT

5. Has the City been negotiating with BSRE? If so, for how long and what is the nature of the negotiations?

Yes. We have been negotiating with BSRE on and off since August 2011, but those efforts quickly picked up pace in the Fall of 2012 after the Court of Appeals upheld the vesting of BSRE permits. We are seeking an agreement that will provide residents with a direct role in identifying mitigation and in developing a plan to lessen adverse impacts from BSRE's proposed development at Point Wells. Absent an agreement, input from the Shoreline community would be extremely limited. Instead of being an active part of determining what mitigation would occur, Shoreline residents would only be able to respond to what BSRE and Snohomish County decided. The terms of the agreement would be similar to what is contained in the City's August 2011 Letter of Intent to BSRE. Such terms include:

- A traffic cap on the maximum number of vehicle trips on Richmond Beach Drive NW leaving from the Point Wells development;
- A requirement that the impacts from Point Wells traffic do not result in intersection delays beyond the City's standard;
- A Transportation Corridor Study (TCS) that goes above and beyond the required Snohomish County process by providing Shoreline residents with a voice in how the impacts from the development are managed, including pedestrian facilities and cut through traffic mitigation

Depending upon the outcome of the TCS, a second agreement, or Municipal Services Agreement could then be considered by the City and BSRE. This second agreement would in part address such issues as:

- Guaranteed funding for safety and traffic flow improvements needed as a result of the additional traffic during construction and from the future residents of the Point Wells development; and
- Legal provisions for the City of Shoreline to annex Point Wells or provide maintenance fees in order to provide a long-term funding source for ongoing maintenance and operating costs. The burden of maintaining these services should not be left solely to existing Shoreline taxpayers

without adequate measures to compensate for it. With annexation Point Wells becomes part of the City of Shoreline tax base.

6. What are the risks and what are the benefits of not reaching a binding agreement until after you have exhausted your legal options?

As a result of the Court of Appeals' decision, BSRE is moving forward with its planned development. Currently, that means working with Snohomish County to complete the permitting process. It is during the permitting process that impacts and mitigations must be identified. If the City and residents want to have a say in what those impacts are and how they will be mitigated, the time to do it is while BSRE is going through the permitting process. If we wait until all legal options are exhausted, it will be too late to influence mitigation measures agreed to during the permitting process.

If we delay action until a Supreme Court decision is made it would likely eliminate the opportunity for us to negotiate with BSRE; in essence, we would have to rely upon the Snohomish County SEPA process to protect the City's interests. We would lose the ability to negotiate for:

- A specific level of mitigation improvements with direct involvement by Shoreline residents in influencing the level of improvements, parcel by parcel.
- A maximum traffic volume, or "cap" for the development, and the ability to assure the traffic projections for each phase of development are accurate over time.
- Developer funding for the specific mitigation within a specific timeframe to ensure mitigation is in place prior to the impacts occurring.
- Annexation as a tool to insure the development pays their share of long-term maintenance costs.

We will be very involved in working through the project review process regardless of whether an agreement is reached with BSRE. However, if this were the only path chosen, the City would be relying on Snohomish County to decide on what mitigation is necessary, the timing of installation and funding for mitigation, how many trips are appropriate on our roads, and what other services are impacted. We are concerned that the Snohomish County project review process will not adequately address development impacts.

7. Why would BSRE want to enter into such an agreement? How does the City ensure that BSRE actually does what it says it will?

BSRE is likely interested in a municipal agreement because, if it were adopted, it would potentially save them the delay and uncertainty of having to fight repeated challenges made by the City during the Snohomish County permit hearing process before Snohomish County's hearing examiner and County Council. The project needs to have an Environmental Impact Statement, a major piece of which will be a lengthy and expensive transportation analysis, identifying impacts and mitigations. It is in BSRE's interest to only pay for this work once and to have the City feel confident about the accuracy and adequacy of the EIS. Therefore, by reaching an agreement with the City to address the same issues, BSRE would ask Snohomish County to adopt the City agreed to Transportation Corridor Study as a component of the EIS.

Once the parties have entered into an agreement, the conditions to the agreement are binding upon all parties to the agreement.

8. What have you agreed to in principle with BSRE?

The City and BSRE have executed a memorandum of understanding (Memorandum) to conduct a transportation corridor study (Study) of the Richmond Beach Drive/Road Corridor. Since Snohomish

County is legally required to process BSRE's permit application, due to start this spring, the City was intent on reaching an agreement with BSRE to conduct a more thorough transportation study than what would be required in the permit process. The City wanted to provide Shoreline residents with a direct voice in identifying corridor improvements, including those improvements directly impacting individual properties.

The Memorandum provides for a study that includes an extensive public participation process, a study area that includes more neighborhood streets and intersections than just Richmond Beach Road and Drive, a guaranteed maximum right-of-way width limit of 60 feet for Richmond Beach Road and Drive, and application of City's traffic standards rather than unincorporated Snohomish County's. These benefits would not have been guaranteed through any other means than the Memorandum between the City and BSRE.

The Memorandum grants Shoreline's most affected residents the ability to participate in up to six (6) public meetings that focus solely on traffic impacts and mitigation. State regulations only require Snohomish County to conduct one environmental scoping meeting to cover all impacts from the development. The City Council found this level of public participation unacceptable and worked to guarantee a better process for Shoreline residents.

A significant concern heard by residents is the traffic volume generated by the planned development. Through the Memorandum, the City has secured a traffic study process that is focused on addressing the concerns of Shoreline residents. The Memorandum assumes a maximum traffic volume of 11,587 average daily automobile trips, which includes the total trips leaving and entering the development once the development is completely built out. This will be the basis for identifying required improvements to the corridor.

In addition, the Study will measure anticipated traffic volumes and congestion levels along connecting streets and intersections. The intent is to eliminate cut-through traffic in surrounding neighborhoods.

The Memorandum ensures the typical 60 foot right-of-way width on Richmond Beach Road and Drive will remain the maximum width allowed, except where the study concludes that isolated corners at intersections are necessary to accommodate such improvements as turn lanes, sidewalks or curbing.

9. How close are you to reaching a binding agreement and what is your timeline for this?

The City and BSRE have executed an agreement to complete the Transportation Corridor Study (TCS). It is likely that the TCS will be completed by September 2013. The TCS will provide the list of mitigation projects for a given amount of traffic and would be included in the final negotiated Municipal Services Agreement. The City would like to have a Municipal Services Agreement by December 31, 2013. The Municipal Services Agreement is intended to include a commitment to annex to Shoreline or provide an alternate maintenance fee; enforceable traffic trip caps for the entire project and for each phase; and secured funding for the mitigation projects.

10. What problems remain in the way of a negotiated agreement at this time?

Completion of the TCS and agreement on the future traffic mitigation will be needed before a final negotiated Municipal Services Agreement can be executed.

11. Given all the concerns the community has expressed on the negative impacts to quality of life and land values, describe specifically how an agreement will be in the best overall interests of our community?

As Point Wells is in Snohomish County, the decisions regarding BSRE's project permit applications, including size, scale, scope, impacts, and mitigation, are made by Snohomish County. Unfortunately,

state law does not allow the City to veto the project actions by Snohomish County. Under existing Snohomish County rules, the City can raise concerns and make suggestions regarding the project at specific points in Snohomish County's review process for BSRE's development permit; however, the City has no jurisdiction or authority in decision making. Under Snohomish County's code, BSRE is required to complete a transportation study to anticipate impacts of the development and to identify mitigation to address those impacts through the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) process. This is the default course of action that would prevail in the absence of an agreement with BSRE.

Following this process, BSRE would not be required to include extensive public participation opportunities as part of the transportation study. Furthermore, BSRE would not be obligated to negotiate directly with us for any mitigation. Although the City would have an opportunity to comment on the impacts and provide input on what should be considered for mitigation, Snohomish County ultimately would make the final decision on what conditions may or may not apply to the permit. Staff is, and continues to be concerned that limiting the City's future actions to Snohomish County's SEPA and permit review process will prove inadequate in protecting the Shoreline community's interests.

In addition, the City is concerned that absent Shoreline's contribution to the traffic study portion of the environmental review, the traffic models used may not accurately reflect the transportation issues in Shoreline. By being part of the process we can ensure a more accurate representation of traffic behaviors in Shoreline, which in turn ensures proper mitigation is considered.

It is in our interest to have a hands-on role in shaping a transportation study that we have confidence in rather than simply being a bystander/commenter on a transportation impact analysis done as part of Snohomish County's EIS process.

12. What does the term mitigation mean?

Mitigation is the action taken to diminish negative impacts. BSRE's proposed Point Wells development will significantly impact traffic on the Richmond Beach Drive/Road corridor, and on side streets. To lessen those impacts and make them more manageable, BSRE will need to make improvements to the road network (adding lanes, traffic control devices, sidewalks, bicycle paths, traffic calming tools, etc.) to lessen those traffic impacts. BSRE will "mitigate" the impacts caused by increased traffic.

13. What is the anticipated timeline for the SEPA process, agreement(s) between BSRE/City/County, the TCS and Planning Commission/City Council review and/or adoption of any comprehensive plan amendments and road classification changes?

Snohomish County will determine the SEPA timeline. Currently they have informed us that they anticipate the SEPA scoping and comment period will occur in May and that they will hold two scoping meetings in late May or early June. If this holds true, then it is likely that the TCS will kick-off in June and be complete by September. The City anticipates that Planning Commission and Council review of any comprehensive plan amendments and road classification changes would occur between September and December of 2013. This schedule is contingent on getting a final SEPA timeline from Snohomish County.

14. The City is pursuing major improvements to move a lot of cars, and quickly, to access the proposed Point Wells development. Why do we want a wide boulevard to help get the developer's prospective buyers to and from the property?

We have not proposed developing a wide boulevard into Point Wells nor do we envision such a boulevard being necessary. In fact, the Memorandum between the City and BSRE ensures the typical 60 foot right-of-way width on Richmond Beach Road and Drive will remain the maximum width allowed, except where the study concludes that isolated corners at intersections are necessary to accommodate such improvements as turn lanes, sidewalks or curbing.

If BSRE builds its proposed development at Point Wells, it will cause significant traffic impacts in Shoreline. If we are not prepared for those impacts, it will be Shoreline residents that will be most affected. Under Snohomish County's regulations, the Richmond Beach Drive/Road corridor could accommodate a development of the size proposed by BSRE with modest improvements. Residents and visitors to Point Wells will have relatively easy access since there are limited traffic control measures on the lower part of the corridor. The people impacted will be Shoreline residents as they try to get in and out of their driveways or access the corridor from side-streets, and as they try to walk or bike along the corridor.

ANNEXATION

15. What mitigation is the City seeking, other than those related directly to road engineering?

In addition to seeking mitigation for traffic impacts, we are also seeking agreement from BSRE to allow the Point Wells subarea to later be annexed into the City of Shoreline to provide ongoing financial support necessary to provide services utilized by future Point Wells residents. If an agreement on annexation is not reached, then the City will seek a maintenance fee to pay for a proportionate share of road repair and replacement. Agreement from BSRE is a key step towards the future annexation.

16. Even if the developer agrees to annex to the City of Shoreline, can Snohomish County stop annexation from happening?

Snohomish County and Woodway could possibly contest annexation before the Boundary Review Board. To address that possibility, we continue to discuss annexation plans with Snohomish County and Woodway to help ensure their support.

Another benefit to having an agreement with BSRE is that we can include language that provides a "maintenance fee" to be paid for by the Point Wells property owners in perpetuity if annexation is not successful. We have calculated a cost figure to maintain the roadway surface that would be attributable to the increased traffic from the development.

17. What is Council's vision of Shoreline? Is it another Kirkland/Edmonds/Bellevue? Is it urban?

The Council's vision of Point Wells specifically is set forth in the City's adopted Point Wells Subarea Plan, which identifies the property as part of Shoreline's designated "Future Service and Annexation Area. It must be urban since it is within both Snohomish County and Shoreline's urban growth area. It calls for an environmentally sustainable mixed use development of the area, although at a much smaller scale than that allowed by Snohomish County's Point Wells Urban Center Zoning.

18. Why pursue annexation? Won't the City inherit all the problems at the site? If Point Wells is annexed, how will the City of Shoreline provide the services the City must provide?

As the only way to reach Point Wells is via Shoreline, future residents and businesses at Point Wells will use City facilities like roads and parks, and place unfunded demands on City services, from police to planning, regardless of whether or not they are annexed into the City. Also, future residents of Point Wells will frequent Shoreline businesses, attend Shoreline based churches and cultural programs, and participate in service clubs and sports teams. Due to their proximity, they will de facto become a part of our community and daily life. Since all City facilities and services are paid for by Shoreline taxpayers, it is only fair that the future Point Wells residents share in that tax burden. Staff believes that annexation is the most appropriate way for future residents of Point Wells to fund the impacts created by the development.

Finally, since the 1990s, the City's Comprehensive Plan has identified Point Wells as the City's Potential Annexation Area. Although Woodway has also identified it as part of their "Municipal Urban Growth Area", there is no direct vehicular access to Point Wells from the majority of Woodway on the upper bluff. In contrast, over four miles of Shoreline roads and half a dozen intersections are traversed between Point Wells and Interstate 5.

The School District has been consulted on the Point Wells issue and has stated that any students at Point Wells would remain a part of the Edmonds School District even if annexed into Shoreline; however, they would most likely choose to attend schools in Shoreline. In that case, they could apply for a waiver/transfer to Shoreline schools, and a portion of the state allocation per student would go to Shoreline School District. While it is unlikely that there will be a lot of school age children at Point Wells, the School District may welcome an increase in student population in its west side schools.

TRANSPORTATION CORRIDOR STUDY

19. Who is obligated (legally) to conduct the traffic study and who is obligated (legally) to accept the results of the traffic study? Who is in charge of completing the Transportation Corridor Study? Who is paying for it? When will it be completed? What is the budget for the facilitator?

BSRE is legally responsible for providing a traffic study as part of Snohomish County's EIS requirement and this is paid for by BSRE. BSRE has agreed to complete a more comprehensive transportation corridor study (TCS) using Shoreline's level of service criteria, our methodology and our assumptions. The TCS will provide a much greater role and opportunity for community input. Absent the agreement, Snohomish County will use their own level of service standards, methodologies and assumptions for evaluating the traffic study and it will involve far less community input. We are working with BSRE and Snohomish County to ensure that this more robust transportation corridor study will be accepted by Snohomish County as the traffic study to fulfill its EIS requirement.

BSRE will pay for the traffic engineering portion of the study and the City will pay for facilitation of the public meetings and outreach. The City anticipates that the facilitation budget will be approximately $34,000. We anticipate completing beginning the TCS in June after Snohomish County completes it's scoping of the EIS. We would have the community outreach workshops in the summer, completing the study recommendations in August.

20. Even though we have a 4,000 ADT cap on affected roads in Richmond Beach now, the developer does not have to abide by this standard. What is the City negotiating if we are just going to set a higher ADT limit that the developer will still not have to abide by?

We are negotiating caps for each phase of the development. The caps would be part of the legally binding agreement and therefore enforceable by the courts. The agreement will detail how the caps will be measured. Once a cap is reached, the developer must mitigate impacts of increased traffic before continuing on with the next phase of the development. In the alternative, BSRE either voluntarily or by contract with the City could complete all of the mitigation upfront so as not to have the corridor under construction during each new phase of development at Point Wells.

21. How will we look at and assess the impacts to bicycle access on Richmond Beach Road and Richmond Beach Drive? What about speed and ways to protect our children walking along the roads?

Ensuring bicycle and pedestrian safety will be a big part of the transportation corridor study.

22. NW 204th Street and 23rd Place NW are two roads to be included in the study. Is a road to the Point Wells development being proposed off 20th Avenue NW, down 21st Place NW (which becomes

23rd Place NW as it enters Woodway)? In other words, are NW 204th Street west of 20th Avenue NW and its neighboring roads being considered as an entrance to the proposed development?

A new entrance to the Point Wells development is not being proposed off 20th Avenue NW down to 21st Place NW. These roads are included in the study as potential streets that could see an increased number of trips as a result of redevelopment at Point Wells. The Study will not just be looking at Richmond Beach Drive and Road, but will include all surrounding side streets and other major intersections continuing on N 185th Street to I-5 and as far south as Shoreline Community College.

23. If 3,000 units are built, what is the estimated number of additional automobile trips per day in and out of the development?

The estimate that has been used in the Snohomish County SEIS is approximately 11,587 additional trips per day.

24. Could a two-lane winding road (Richmond Beach Drive) be considered adequate to handle the number of estimated trips or would it need to be increased to four lanes keeping in mind that most trips would be in the morning and evening as people commute to work?

The existing two-lane road (Richmond Beach Drive), as currently configured is not adequate to safely manage the 11,587 possible trips that are currently proposed by the BSRE development at Point Wells. Through the Transportation Corridor Study, we plan to establish a morning (a.m.) and evening (p.m.) peak hour trip count cap in and out of the proposed development. The trip cap would be established to preserve the City's adopted level of service "D". Currently BSRE may be vested to an older level of service "E", which includes higher trip counts equating to more delays. The Study will identify the mitigation necessary to maintain a level of service "D". Such mitigation could include: installing new bike and pedestrian facilities; widening and re-channeling the existing road using only the existing right of way (which is wider than the existing pavement); making intersection improvements (some additional right of way may need to be acquired); and adding signalization and traffic calming measures to manage traffic flow to allow for safe turns, ingress and egress to driveways, street crossings and to limit cut through traffic.

While four lanes may be an option, it is staff's preliminary opinion that three lanes will likely be sufficient to manage the volume of traffic. This is based upon staff's experience with similar roads in the city and within the region (e.g. 15th from 145th to 175th). However, as the traffic moves east up the corridor, it will disburse through the network, but add to the existing volumes. At some point, once Point Wells has been fully developed, four to five lanes may be necessary to accommodate the traffic as the corridor gets closer to Aurora. The Study will help determine at which point that might be necessary.

25. It seems to me that public comment regarding Richmond Beach Drive from 199th to 205th concerning amenities such as sidewalks is a moot point. Surely there would need to be sidewalks, but amenities are the least of the worries for the people of Richmond Beach. Is the public comment simply a required part of the process?

Public participation is not required, but will be very important in designing the mitigation. Snohomish County is continuing to process the now vested permits for development of Point Wells as an Urban Center. A transportation corridor study will allow the community, City staff, and BSRE to more closely examine the effects of additional traffic on Richmond Beach Drive, Richmond Beach Road, surrounding side streets and other major intersections all the way up N. 185th Street to I-5. This includes looking at the time delay at intersections, ability for residents to safely access their driveways or intersections, and safety concerns for pedestrians and bicyclists. This will be a parcel by parcel discussion along Richmond Beach Drive NW between the county line and NW 195th Street.

26. The City Council is considering adopting the 2013 docket that includes considering reclassifying Richmond Beach Drive to a collector arterial, which can have a maximum right of way width of 80-feet. Will the City pursue purchasing additional right of way beyond the existing 60-foot right of way along Richmond Beach Drive? Could the City pursue this in the future if staff or leadership change that may currently be opposed to expanding the right of way to the maximum limit?

The functional classification of a street (i.e. local or arterial) does not necessarily dictate the right-of-way requirements.

We use a common street functional classification system based upon the amount of average daily traffic (ADT) typically forecasted over a planning period of twenty years. These classifications are reflected in the City's Transportation Master Plan (TMP). For each functional classification, a maximum right-of-way width is identified for planning purposes. A roadway within a given classification will not necessarily need the maximum width. In fact, the Master Street Plan for the City's roadways (contained within the TMP) identifies a planned cross-section for many streets within the City that fall below the maximum allowed. The rationale for reclassifying Richmond Beach Drive to a collector arterial is based upon the anticipated outcomes of the Transportation Corridor Study (TCS). The City's adopted Subarea Plan for Point Wells allowed for an increase in the average daily traffic for Richmond Beach Drive upon completion of a TCS and the commitment of financing sources for mitigation. Currently Richmond Beach Drive between NW 205th and NW 199th Street is classified as a local secondary street. Local secondary streets are characterized as providing local access, having a daily volume of less than 3,000 vehicles per day and no allowance for bus stops. Collector arterials are characterized as having a daily volume of vehicles between 2,000 and 8,000, allow for bus stops and provide access to community services and businesses. Collector arterials have speed limits of 25-30 miles per hour and connect traffic from non arterial streets to higher classified streets. If the use and performance of the roadway change, then the characteristics of Richmond Beach Drive may best be described as a collector arterial.

We are not proposing to increase the right-of-way width along any part of the corridor beyond what exists today, except for what might be needed at intersections in order to meet the requirements of the City's Level-of-Service (LOS) standard. In other words, the City is not requiring a right-of-way width of 80 feet as noted in the Transportation Master Plan. It is also worth noting that the maximum right-of-way needs for a Local Secondary Street is 90 feet. Upon completion of the TCS, the City can amend the Master Street Plan and adopt a cross-section for Richmond Beach Drive that identifies the planned improvements and the maximum right-of-way width.

27. In addition to the topic of the corridor study, what are your plans for involving the community from this point forward?

The City will provide a high level of communication throughout the transportation corridor study process and the steps following the study. This will include updates to the City Council, providing regular e-mail updates to community members, and responding to community questions. The City will provide the most recent information regarding the Snohomish County SEPA process on its website and endeavor to keep other critical information regarding the agreement and development activity readily available for Shoreline residents.

28. Who is in charge of environmental cleanup, and who is responsible for enforcing it?

The property owner is responsible for environmental cleanup. Snohomish County, in developing the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), will have to address the nature, degree and location of contamination on the property as well as the methods and timing for cleanup. State and federal agencies have jurisdiction over contamination issues and will be sent a copy of the Draft EIS for review and comment.