



**Eastin, Darryl**

---

**From:** Nancy Morris <ncm@w-link.net>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 02, 2014 12:40 PM  
**To:** Eastin, Darryl  
**Subject:** addendum comments to the EIS comments on the Point Wells Development: File Number 11-101457-LU

Dear Darryl Eastin:

Further comments I would like to emphasize are the lack of considering the accelerated ice loss in the Arctic. The sea ice loss is already well outside the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) IPCC's worst case scenarios. Already east of Russia is a new sea due to recent ice melt that is 4x the size of Texas. Major developments at Point Wells will be impacted by Arctic Ice melt and it is upon us now and certainly will get worse here within a few decades if not before.

The current proposed 16-18 story buildings planned at Point Wells do not take into account the rapid sea ice loss. Sixteen to eighteen story buildings will be impacted and the EIS should take into account the worst case scenarios of ice melt. Further the EIS needs to study the possible impact of major earthquakes in this area where such buildings would be sited.

Another major concern is how will the developer contain the dust and particulate matter during the construction phase and how toxic material will be safely contained so as not to harm residents of Shoreline, the neighborhoods near Point Wells, and the Puget Sound.

The EIS must include a study of the impacts of the mitigation proposals on the huge increases of traffic. Right now, people are speeding down Richmond Beach Road and several of the access side streets with the population level we have now. Will mitigation of proposed traffic increases actually work or should the scope of the Point Wells development be greatly reduced?

The residents of Shoreline most impacted by the Point Wells development do not have any say over the outcomes of the EIS nor the integrity of the consultants drafting the EIS used by Snohomish County.. **Therefore the Snohomish County consultants studying and drafting the EIS should also be answerable to the citizen's group, "Save Richmond Beach," the City of Woodway, along with the City of Shoreline.** If not, tendencies to cut corners may happen as they have in previous developments that were thought to be safe in the state of Washington. One only has to read about the recent death toll of the OSO landslide in Snohomish County. If the Department of Natural Resources truly looked out for the public good, this slide would not have happened. The Snohomish County government did not sound any alarm bells either over the years on clearcutting dangers, which really raises concerns to many people; who will really look out for the citizens as Point Wells enters into its development phase. For more on the lack of governmental oversight and regulation leading to the horrific Oso slide, please go to: [http://seattletimes.com/html/localnews/2023225363\\_mudslideloggingxml.html](http://seattletimes.com/html/localnews/2023225363_mudslideloggingxml.html)

**"State allowed logging on plateau above slope"**

*"In recent decades the state allowed logging — with restrictions — on the plateau above the Snohomish County hillside that collapsed in last weekend's deadly mudslide." . . .*

*""Paul Kennard, a geologist for the Tulalip Tribes, warned regulators that harvesting holds "the potential for a massive and catastrophic failure of the entire hillslope.""*

Once again, due to such limited access to Point Wells, this proposed development will cause undo harm to entire long established neighborhoods, the city of Woodway, and violation of The Washington State Growth Management Act. This this development should go back to the drawing board. In all honesty it would be better

to clean up this area of toxic waste and create a major park and natural area that would be purchased by the State of Washington.

Regards,  
Nancy Morris  
Shoreline resident

On Mar 6, 2014, at 2:42 PM, Eastin, Darryl wrote:

Hello Ms. Morris,

Thank you for your comments regarding the scope of the EIS for Point Wells. I will print your comments for the project file (11-101457 LU) and forward it to our electronic EIS scoping comment file.

Darryl

Darryl Eastin, AICP  
Principal Planner  
Snohomish County Planning & Development Services  
425-388-3311, X1068  
Darryl.Eastin@co.snohomish.wa.us

NOTICE: All emails, and attachments, sent to and from Snohomish County are public records and may be subject to disclosure pursuant to the Public Records Act (RCW 42.56)

---

From: Nancy Morris [mailto:[ncm@w-link.net](mailto:ncm@w-link.net)]  
Sent: Monday, March 03, 2014 1:24 PM  
To: Eastin, Darryl  
Subject: EIS comments on the Point Wells Development: File Number 11-101457-LU

Attn: Darryl Eastin:

RE: EIS comments on the Point Wells Development: File Number 11-101457-LU

I would like to include the entire scope of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) comments submitted by the City of Shoreline as part of my comments, because as a citizen of Shoreline, I addressed a number of the concerns that are included in the City of Shoreline scope of the EIS for the development of Point Wells. These comments to be inclusive are found at: <http://www.shorelinewa.gov/Home/ShowDocument?id=15894>.

One major concern is the lack of permitting authority by the City of Shoreline and King County. Snohomish County (who has been issuing the permits thus far) needs to address this issue in an ethical manner, besides just a legal manner, by not lowering standards that would allow various permitting to go through with lesser standards than those requested by the City of Shoreline, residents of the Richmond Beach neighborhood, residents of the Innis Arden neighborhood, and the City of Woodway in the comments of the EIS for the Point Wells Development.

Regards,  
Nancy Morris  
Shoreline resident  
206-533-6155