



Eastin, Darryl

From: patholz@comcast.net
Sent: Saturday, February 22, 2014 5:17 PM
To: Eastin, Darryl
Subject: Point Wells Mixed-use Redevelopment Project EIS, Public Comments on Scope of EIS

I attended the February 18, 2014 meeting at Shoreline and have the following comments. I am a resident of Woodway for 35 years and have followed the path of this project.

1. I have a mistrust for the officials in Snohomish County on this project. I believe the project did not follow the Growth Management guidelines of the County but the officials approved the project when it was submitted by the developer before a change in rules. My understanding is that the project as proposed as an Urban Center would not be approved today, but it is now grandfathered in. My understanding is that it could have an Urban Center designation because it is on a rail line, although BNSF has no plans to put a station at the location. My understanding is that Urban Centers are more typically located near freeways, not at the location of Point Wells, at the end of a two lane road. This is just the wrong size development for its location and the surrounding development. It appears to me that the County wants the development and is siding with the developer.

2. I see no significant difference between Alternate 1 and 2. The number of units are within 15% of each other, that is not a significant alternative. The other alternative is no action, which is fine, until another reasonable alternative is proposed.

3. Any development will have a negative impact on the Town of Woodway as transportation is concerned. Proposed development will increase vehicle traffic in Woodway. Currently, Woodway strictly enforces its 25 MPH speed limit for the safety of the many pedestrians, (walkers, dog walkers, runners) both resident and non-resident, who use the shoulder provided on one side of most thru roads in Woodway. Woodway is also on a bicycle route with many thru bikers. With the winding roadway of Woodway Park Road and Wachusetts Road, there is presently congestion at times with the convergence of cars, bikers, and pedestrians. I do not see the feasibility of a road through Woodway to connect Point Wells with Edmonds or Highway 104. Just the existence of a large development will increase the traffic through Woodway.

4. Is there any development anywhere on Puget Sound as large as the proposal and as close to the water with the lack of supporting utilities? Outside of Seattle and Tacoma, I don't believe there is such a development.

5. The issue of the property taxes going to Snohomish County while the burden of Point Wells will fall primarily on King County is very significant and I expect that to be addressed.

6. The transportation issue is also significant and must be addressed.

7. The developer at one time indicated that they would have their own fire and police protection on site, is that still part of the developer's proposal?

I will look forward to an objective and impartial evaluation of the environmental and economic consequences of this proposed project.

Gil Holzmeyer