

## Countryman, Ryan

---

**From:** Tom McCormick <tommccormick@mac.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 24, 2015 9:21 AM  
**To:** Countryman, Ryan  
**Cc:** White, Clay; Tom Mailhot; Debbie Tarry; Eric Faison  
**Subject:** 2nd public access road to Point Wells [corrected version]

[resending with corrected second paragraph]

Ryan,

I am aware that BSRE has talked with the owners of the upper bluff property about possibly acquiring the property, or at least an easement.

The attached upper bluff drawing shows a possible emergency access road for Point Wells. It's my understanding that if BSRE does not acquire the upper bluff property, the owner may nonetheless offer BSRE an easement for an emergency access road (see attached drawing). One would think, however, that the owner would not want to offer an easement for a full public access road to connect to its development as that would channel Point Wells traffic through the development.

Our position is and has always been that under the Snohomish County Code and EDDS, as well as fundamental land use and planning principles, a full second public access road to Point Wells is required, not merely an emergency access road. See the several emails that I sent the County in 2014.

Should BSRE fail to acquire the upper bluff property for possible use as a full second public access road, and later contend that it is unable to build a full second public access road because it does not own and cannot acquire any property to build a full second public access road, we will ask the County to deny BSRE's application. Our position will be that property for a full second public access road was available for purchase and a full second public access road could have been built. In these circumstances, BSRE will have no one to blame but itself if its purported inability to build a full second public access road results in the denial of its application.

Feel free to share this email with BSRE.

Thank you.

Tom McCormick

