



**Snohomish County**  
**Planning and Development Services**

Aaron Reardon  
County Executive

Clay White, Director  
3000 Rockefeller Avenue M/S #604  
Everett, WA 98201-4046  
(425) 388-3311 FAX (425) 388-3832

**REVIEW COMPLETION LETTER**

**FILE NO'S:** 11-101007 SP ; 11-101457 LU;  
11-101461 SM

**DATE:** April 12, 2013

**PROJECT NAME:** Point Wells Development

**APPLICANT:**

BSRE Point Wells, LP c/o  
Karr, Tuttle, Campbell  
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 2900  
Seattle, WA 98101

**CONTACT:**

Karr, Tuttle, Campbell  
Doug Luetjen  
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 1201  
Seattle, WA 98101

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

Nine lot short plat, Urban Center Development, LDA, Shoreline SDP and retaining walls for development of an urban center project containing residential, commercial, mixed use, police/fire space and public amenities on a 60.9 acre site zoned UC. Project will be constructed in four phases including: approximately 28 multi-story residential buildings and 17 multi-story mixed use buildings containing 3,081 dwelling units and approximately 68,000 square feet (SF) of commercial space; and two, one-story mixed use buildings containing approximately 58,562 SF of retail space and floor area for on-site police and fire services. Total residential space equals approximately 96% of the total project floor area and total commercial (office and retail) space equals approximately 4% of the total floor area.

**REQUIRED INFORMATION:**

The following information is required to further evaluate your proposal.

**Note:** This application will expire one year after the date of this memorandum (**April 12, 2014**) if the applicant fails to provide All requested information per SCC 30.70.140(1). **This review letter does not include comments on the Land Disturbing Activities (11-101008 LDA) and Retaining Wall (11-101464 RC) permit applications.**

**Planner Comments:**

Project Manager: Darryl Eastin (425) 388-3311, Ext 1068

**Urban Center Development Comments**

- (a) This review does not include comments on Land Disturbing Activities and Retaining wall permit applications.
- (b) Please indicate all recorded easements and encumbrances on short subdivision and urban center development site plans, if not indicated.
- (c) Does proposal include construction of a public building on the public building site at this time? If so, please indicate which project phase that it would be constructed and proposed floor area.
- (d) Is there retail floor area in Buildings UP-T1 – UP-T4?
- (e) Is the 26,300 SF of retail space for Buildings UP-T1 – UP-T4 located between and/or within these buildings?
- (f) In which building or buildings is the 32,262 SF of office space located?
- (g) Is the 24,000 SF of retail space for Buildings SV-T1 – SV-T6 located between and/or within these buildings?
- (h) Is the 24,000 SF of retail space for Buildings SV-L1 – SV-L7 located between and/or within these buildings?
- (i) Is the 44,000 SF of retail space for Buildings CV-T1 – CV-T7 located between and/or within these buildings?
- (j) It appears from review of the enlarged site plans for the urban plaza, central plaza, south plaza and north plaza that there may be 15 mixed use (residential/retail) buildings. Is his correct?
- (k) Could not find elevations for the following buildings:
  - 1. Envac/retail bldg
  - 2. Fire/Police/retail bldg
  - 3. UP-T1 – UP-T4
  - 4. SV-T1 – SV-T6
  - 5. SV-L1 – SV-L7
  - 6. CV-T1 – CV-T7
- (l) Please provide a project data table indicating the following data for each building:
  - 1. Stories
  - 2. Height in feet above ground level
  - 3. Structured parking spaces
  - 4. Residential units
  - 5. Residential floor area
  - 6. Office floor area

7. Retail floor area
8. Civic floor area
9. Police/fire floor area
10. Energy center floor area
11. Envac floor area

- (m) Do the enlarge site plans for the four villages indicate location of overall sections shown on A-331 and A-330? If not, please add section lines.
- (n) Project contains 47 multistory buildings including approximately 15 multistory buildings with a mix of residential and commercial space. The project meets definition of "mixed use" per SCC 30.34A.030. The maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) for mixed use development is 2.0 and minimum FAR is 1.0. A FAR 1.17 is proposed.
- (o) Minimum drive aisle width for surface and structured parking adjacent to perpendicular parking stalls is 25 feet pursuant to SCC Table 30.26.065(13). This Table also provides dimensional requirements for other types of drive aisles and parking stall configurations.
- (p) Propose shared parking shall comply with the requirements of SCC 30.34A.050(6).
- (q) Are structured parking entrances located behind or to the side of buildings pursuant to SCC 30.34A.050(1)?
- (r) Parking requirements for urban center are determined by the parking ratios in SCC Table 30.34A.050. In order to determine the parking requirement for the project, the following data is needed:
- Total restaurant floor area
  - Total retail floor area
  - Total office floor area
  - Total residential units over 1,000 SF
  - Total residential units less than 1,000 SF
  - Total civic building floor area
  - Total police/fire floor area

A parking demand analysis may be required for uses not listed in the above table pursuant to SCC 30.34A.050(5).

- (s) Sheets A-050 and 051 indicate location of an Ordinary High Water Line along the shoreline. Sheets C-201 – 203 indicate location of a Line Mean Higher High Water along the shoreline. Do these terms represent the same the same line?

- (t) Please indicate on project plans if any petroleum storage tanks will remain on north part of site after completion of Phase 1 or other phases.
- (u) Due to the existence of contaminated soils on the site as indicated in the SEPA checklist, it is likely PDS will require that a hydrogeologic report be prepared for the proposal.
- (v) Several proposed buildings will be located near adjacent residential properties in the Town of Woodway that are zoned R-14.5 and R-9600. These buildings will need to comply with the building height and setback requirements of SCC 30.34A.040.
- (w) Several proposed buildings will be over 90 feet in height. Due to the proposed height, an environmental impact statement (EIS) is required that shall include at a minimum an analysis of the the impacts of the height on; aesthetics; light and glare; noise; air quality and transportation per SCC 30.34A.040.
- (x) Landscaping for the urban center project will need to comply with the requirements of SCC 30.25.015, 30.25.017, 30.25.023, 30.25.043, 30.25.045 and 30.34A.060.
- (y) Proposed open spaces shall comply with the requirements of SCC 30.34A.070.
- (z) The project will need to comply with urban center design standards that correspond to the following project design elements pursuant to SCC 30.34A.100; 110; 120; 130; 140; 150 and 160:
  - 1. Trash enclosures/service areas
  - 2. Rooftop mechanical equipment
  - 3. Lighting and lighting fixtures
  - 4. Building façade height and roof edge
  - 5. Building massing and articulation
  - 6. Building ground level detail and transparency
  - 7. Overhead weather protection
  - 8. Blank building walls
- (aa) Review of the urban center architectural plans did not indicate proposed project signs or sign program. At some point in the application review process, a sign program should be proposed in order to determine compliance with SCC 30.34A.090 requirements.

- (bb) Given the proposed removal of the existing sea wall, grading to remove existing soil and placement of additional sand and gravel with the FEMA 100-Year Flood Plain eastward of the Puget Sound shoreline and Line of Mean Higher High Water, a Snohomish County Flood Hazard Permit will be required for the proposal pursuant to SCC 30.65.220(5).
- (cc) Further application review comments will be provided following completion of the project EIS.
- (dd) Proposed public roads, drive aisles and pedestrian facilities shall comply with the applicable requirements of SCC Chapter 30.24, SCC Title 13, SCC 30.34A.080 and the EDDS.
- (ee) The attached section of the Snohomish County Assessor's parcel map appears to indicate that a narrow panhandle of parcel 270335-003-002-00 extends across the current access road to the subject site. Additionally, sheet EX2 indicates a 50' access easement per King County Cause No 05-2-13678-1 on the west portion of the subject property. If the Assessor's parcel map is correct, does this easement provide vehicular access rights across the narrow panhandle? If this access easement does provide access rights, please provide a copy of the recorded access easement demonstrating that the owner of the subject property has access rights across the panhandle.
- (ff) Please respond to attached agency and public comments received to date.

### **Short Subdivision comments**

- (a) Please revise project plans sheet 2 to indicate more detailed explanation of use of all existing structures within 25 feet of external property lines pursuant to SCC 30.41B.040 (submittal requirements)
- (b) Please revise plans to show all recorded easements & easement language, if not already shown.
- (c) Please revise short plat site plan to more clearly indicate proposed vehicle access to all proposed lots.
- (d) Note: Nine subject property tax parcels are indicated on the master application and short plat plans cover sheet. However, only five legal parcels are indicated on short plat site plan. Please revise plans and application accordingly to indicate correct number of legal parcels for the subject property.

- (e) Environmental checklist submitted with the short subdivision application is missing Attachment "C" (visual analysis).
- (f) The proposed short plat will need to comply with applicable vehicle and pedestrian access and roadway design requirements of SCC Chapter 30.41B (Short subdivisions) and the applicable road frontage landscaping requirements of SCC Chapter 30.25 (General development standards - landscaping).
- (g) According to SCC 30.41B.200 (Design standards), access to a short plat property and access to all lots shall be provided by a public road designed and constructed in accordance with EDDS if the Average Daily Trip (ADT) generation for the proposed nine lots is more than 90 trips. Based on the projected trip generation for the short plat, the ADT will be more than 90 trips, therefore a public road will be required to provide access to the subject property and to all proposed lots.

**Shoreline SDP Comments (non-critical areas)**

- (a) Snohomish County Shoreline Management Master Program designates the portion of the Point Wells subject property from the Puget Sound shoreline to the BNSF railroad ROW as a Shoreline Urban Environment. Residential and commercial development, roads, marinas, piers, recreation and shoreline stabilizations are all uses permitted as in the Urban Environment subject to regulatory controls. The project plans and narrative indicate that the current seawall and riprap will be removed and potentially contaminated soil removed landward of the wall. Additionally, a new 20-foot esplanade and small rock seawall/protection structure in front, groins, rain gardens, storm water dispersal/infiltration trenches, improvements to the existing commercial dock (including a small marina) and portions of several multifamily residential structures will be constructed within the 200-foot shoreline management jurisdictional area.
- (b) The following Snohomish County Shoreline Management Master Program Use Activities are applicable to the proposal:

Archaeological and Historical Sites:  
Commercial Development:  
Residential Development:  
Public Access:  
Vegetation Management:  
Water Quality:  
Boating Facilities:  
Beach and Stream Enhancement:  
Jetties and Groins:  
Piers:  
Recreation:

Please review the policies and regulations associated with the above Use Activities to evaluate which are applicable or not applicable to the proposal. If a particular policy or regulation is not applicable, please explain why that is the case. If a policy or regulation is applicable, please address how the proposal is consistent with each.

- (c) If a non-water related commercial use is proposed within the 200-foot shoreline jurisdictional area, a Shoreline Conditional Use permit will be required for the proposal.

### **Conceptual Drainage Review:**

Reviewer: Paul Dragoo, Engineer III (425) 388-3311, Ext 4295

### **Urban Center Development, Short Plat & Shoreline SDP comments**

Please make corrections to the attached marked up drainage report and the following comments:

- 1) **CRITICAL AQUIFER RECHARGE AREAS:** A hydrogeologic report will be required for any activity or use listed in SCC 30.62C.340 within a critical aquifer recharge area with high or moderate groundwater sensitivity. Please address. See SCC 30.62C.140.
- 2) **SEISMIC HAZARD AREAS:** Development activities within 200 feet of a seismic hazard area may be allowed with an approved geotechnical report that confirms the site is suitable for the proposed development and that meet the International Building Code and chapter 30.51A SCC. Under SCC 30.62B.350, please have the geotechnical engineer confirm the site is suitable for the proposed development.
- 3) **LANDSLIDE HAZARD AREAS:** Development activities and clearing are not allowed within landslide hazard areas or setbacks unless there is no alternate location on the property. Therefore, the proposal to locate buildings, grading and retaining walls within the setback and the landslide hazard areas east of the railroad tracks appears in violation of SCC 30.62B.340. Please address.
- 4) The proposed development in the landslide hazard areas does not appear to meet SCC 30.62B.320(1)(a)(iv), (b)(i), (ii) or (iii). Please address.
- 5) The geotechnical report discussed only shorelines of water bodies subject to wind and wave erosion. However, "erosion hazard areas" also includes areas containing soils which are at high risk from water erosion according to the mapped description units of the United States Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service. Please address.

- 6) The geotechnical report dated November 16, 2010 was prepared prior to determination of the building locations, footprint, height or type. Now that much of that information is apparently known, in answering my preceding comments above, the geotechnical engineer's responses need to reflect the current proposal.
- 7) The grading quantities stated on the grading application are 10,000 CY cut and 300,000 CY fill. However, the site will likely require removal of significant contaminated soils that will also require a grading permit, if not the same permit. Please discuss in the report what grading and grading quantities, or other work will likely be required for site preparation.
- 8) The drainage report needs to be stamped by the engineer.
- 9) The proposal to possibly relocate outfall from the southern portion of the site by pumping to the north and discharging at outfall 2 may not be in accordance with SCC 30.63A.520. Please address.
- 10) Please revise the drainage basin maps to clearly show more information about the existing conveyance systems and drainage patterns for upstream drainage through/around the site; include pipe sizes and slopes, structure tops and inverts, ditch size/configuration and slope, etc. For each upstream drainage basin, please clearly indicate the flow paths, outfall locations and their descriptions or outfall numbers on the maps. Where does existing drainage from the railroad property drain? Provide enough information on the basin maps that clearly demonstrates how the proposed fill and walls will not alter or block existing drainage patterns and courses for drainage from railroad property or other upstream areas.
- 11) Provide more detailed storm drainage information on the drainage plans so it is clear where proposed runoff drains to. Show conceptual pipe size, catch basin tops and inverts, and the same for existing.
- 12) I don't know of any exemption in SCC 30.63B.070 (Land disturbing permit exemption) for the proposed contaminated soil remediation process. Please address.

<b>Critical Areas Comments: Wetlands and Fish &amp; Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas</b>
---

Reviewer: Frank Scherf (425) 388-3311, ext. 2725

**Urban Center Development & Shoreline SDP Comments**

- (a) The application does not meet the standard requirements of Chapter 30.62A SCC. Staff suggests that the applicant make a request for review under the innovative development design provisions of SCC 30.62A.350. The critical areas

study shall be revised to demonstrate conformity with the requirements of SCC 30.62A.350(1). All the submittal requirements pursuant to SCC 30.62A.130(1)(f) have not been met. The site development plans do not depict the location and description of all wetlands located within 300 feet of the site. Of issue is the non-classified wetland that lies “at least 200 feet north” of the site. Likely the wetland would be classified as Category 3. The critical areas study shall attempt to classify the wetland in order to determine whether or not a required buffer would extend on-site.

- (b) All the requirements pursuant to SCC 30.62A.130(1)(g) have not been met. The site development plans do not depict the location and description of all other critical areas regulated pursuant to Chapters 30.62B and 30.62C SCC on and within 200 feet of the site. Various critical areas are defined under this requirement including erosion hazard areas along shorelines subject to wind and wave erosion, landslide, seismic, critical aquifer recharge, and tsunami hazard areas. Staff suggests one exhibit page civil plan sheet size that depicts and classifies all critical areas to be shown on the site development plans.
- (c) The Critical Areas Report indicates the presence of non-fish bearing Type N streams in the project vicinity. Are those streams perennial or seasonal (Type Np and/or Type Ns)? On page 28 of the report a ditch/stream #2 was discussed that was previously described in “Section 4.4” of the report. There is no Section 4.4 of the report. I believe the author meant Section 5.4. The report goes on to indicate that this feature could be classified as wetland although it may be considered artificial or man-made. Please provide an analysis under both the stream definition under SCC 30.91S.640 and wetland definition SCC 30.91W.070.
- (d) Please provide clarification of how the project meets the provisions of SCC 30.62A.320(1)(c) regarding impervious surfaces within buffers. SCC 30.62A.330(f)(iii) requires that structures (specifically docks, piers and floats) avoid critical saltwater habitat. SCC 30.91C.362 defines critical saltwater habitats as all kelp beds, eelgrass beds, spawning and holding areas for forage fish, such as herring, smelt and sandlance; subsistence, commercial and recreational shellfish beds; mud flats and intertidal habitats with vascular plants. Please provide an analysis of this specifically.
- (e) Please provide greater detail on the plans for restoring Chevron Creek.
- (f) Sheet A-051 contains a legend with listed constraints. What is the 75-foot buffer constraint from the OHWL under marine water?
- (g) Staff acknowledges that the EIS will evaluate the nearshore processes, critical saltwater habitats and other critical areas issues identified in this memorandum. Installation of the proposed groins is a concern and whether or not they are needed.
- (h) See attached memo dated May 12 7, 2011 for additional information.

**Traffic Review Comments:**

Reviewer: Mark Brown (425) 388-3311, Ext 4536

- (a) See attached memo dated June 7, 2011 for comments.

**Public Works - Transit Compatibility and TDM Review Comments:**

**Transit Compatibility**

Reviewer: Erik Olson (425) 388-3488, Ext 4507

- (a) See attached memo dated June 15, 2011 for comments.

**Transportation Demand Management**

Reviewer: Jay Larson (425) 388-3411, Ext 3614

- (a) See attached memo dated September 6, 2011 for comments.

**Office of the County Fire Marshal:**

Reviewer: Ron Tangen (425) 388-3311 ext 2264

- (a) Fire flow and fire hydrants shall be provided in accordance with Snohomish County Code 30.53A.514 through 30.53A. 520. Fire hydrants serving single-family dwellings shall have a maximum lateral spacing of 600 feet with no lot or parcel in excess of 300 feet from a hydrant. Hydrant locations shall be depicted on the face of the plat, and locations for new hydrants shall be approved by this office. The following requirements shall apply to the installation of any required hydrant:
  - (b) Four (4) inch storz type steamer port fittings shall be provided on new hydrants.
  - (c) The top(s) of the hydrant(s) shall be colored green.
  - (d) Install blue street reflector(s) on the hydrant side of centerline to indicate hydrant location(s).
  - (e) The minimum required fire flow for this project has been determined to be 1,000 GPM at 20 psi for a 1-hour duration. Prior to final plat approval, in order to assure consistency with the applicable provisions of Snohomish County Code 30.53A.520 (16), the developer shall provide the required fire hydrants and written confirmation from the water purveyor that the minimum required fire flow of 1,000

gpm at 20 psi for a 1- hour duration can be provided. If the required fire flow cannot be provided the new dwellings shall be provided with NFPA 13-D fire suppression systems. **If there are dwellings that exceed 3,600 square feet the required fire flow shall be determined using Appendix B of the 2006 edition of the International Fire Code. It shall be noted as a restriction in the recording of the final plat that if there are dwellings that exceed 3,600 square feet the required fire flow shall be determined using Appendix B of the 2009 edition of the International Fire Code.**

- (f) Fire apparatus access shall comply with the requirements of Snohomish County Code UDC 30.53A.512 as follows:
- Fire apparatus access roads shall have an unobstructed width of not less than 20 feet and an unobstructed vertical clearance of not less than 13'6".
  - Roadways shall be constructed of either gravel, asphalt some other all-weather surface capable of supporting vehicles consistent with Engineering Design and Development Standards (EDDS).
  - Turns, bends or sweeps shall be designed at not less than 20' inside-turning radii or less than 40' outside-turning radii.
  - Dead-end roads in excess of 150 feet in length shall be provided with a turnaround unless a modification is granted by the fire marshal.
  - Gradient for roads shall not exceed 15%.
  - Snohomish County Code UDC 30.53A.510 (3) defines a turnaround as a cul-de-sac having a driving surface with a minimum 40' outside radius.
- (g) Planters may be installed in cul-de-sacs when the outside radius of the cul-de-sac is a minimum of 50 feet and the inside radius is a minimum of 25 feet.
- (h) Approved numbers or addresses shall be placed on all new and existing buildings in such a position as to be plainly visible and legible from the street or road fronting the property street signage shall be in place prior to occupancy. Numbers shall contrast with their background Section 505.1 IFC.
- (i) Fire apparatus access shall not be obstructed in any manner including the parking of vehicles. You shall provide signage or pavement striping on both sides of the access road if it is less than 28' in width one side of the road if it is 28' wide but less than 36' wide stating "NO PARKING – FIRE LANE" to ensure access availability. If pavement striping is used the curbs shall be painted yellow with black lettering.

**Snohomish Health District:**

Reviewer: Brent Raasina R.S. (425) 339-5250

- (a) Snohomish Health District has no comment. Sanitary sewers and approved public water are provided.
- (b) See attached letter dated March 24, 2011.

**Other Information Required:**

- (a) A cover letter that identifies the proposed change(s) cross referenced to the comments on this project is required. Be sure to include and identify any additional changes proposed as well. Please provide five (5) copies.

**FURTHER PROJECT REVIEW**

Further application review comments may be provided following completion of the project EIS. The 120-day clock may be stopped for application review and decision while the project EIS is being prepared pursuant to RCW 36.70B.90(1)(b). Please call the Project Manager, **Darryl Eastin (425) 388-3311, ext 1068**, [Darryl.Eastin@co.snohomish.wa.us](mailto:Darryl.Eastin@co.snohomish.wa.us) to arrange for submittal of any requested information. The resubmittal package must address all changes and requests for additional information in order to be accepted.

Please call or send me an e-mail if you have any questions regarding the above comments.

Sincerely,

Darryl Eastin, AICP  
Project Manager/Senior Planner

**Attachments:**

Memorandum from Frank Scherf, PDS Senior Biologist dated May 12, 2011  
Memorandum from Mark Brown, PDS Traffic dated June 7, 2011  
Memorandum from Erik Olson, DPW dated June 15, 2011  
Memorandum from Jay Larson, DPW dated September 6, 2011  
Letters from Stephen Clifton, Community Services & Economic Development Director, City of Edmonds dated March 17, 2011 & April 9, 2011

Letter from from Joseph Tovar, Planning & Development Servies Director, City of Shoreline dated April 11, 2011  
Letter from Carla Nichols, Mayor, Town of Woodway dated April 25, 2011  
E-mails from Scott Rodman, WSDOT received March 7, 2011 & April 8 , 2011  
E-mail from Steve Benenati, WSDOT received April 11 , 2011  
Letter & Certificate of Sewer Availabililty, Ronald Wastewater District dated March 21, 2011  
E-mail from Patricia Lambert, DOE Shoreline Planner received March 22, 2011  
Letter from Snohomish Health District dated March 24, 2011  
Olympic View Water & Sewer District, Preliminary Certificate of Water Availablity letters dated March 31, 2011 & April 1 , 2011  
Letter from Snohomish County PUD, Electricity dated April 8, 2011  
Letter from Community Transit dated April 11, 2011  
E-mails from David South, DOE Toxics Cleanup Porgram received April 15, 2011  
E-mail from Gretchen Kaeler, DAHP received April 19, 2011  
Letter from Meredith Redmon, King County Water Division dated August 2, 2011  
E-mail from Mason Morisset, Tulalip Tribes received March 15, 2011  
E-mail from Mason Morisset, Tulalip Tribes received April 3, 2011  
Letter from Mason Morisset, Tulalip Tribes dated April 11, 2011  
E-mail from Caycee Holt, Save Richmond Beach received March 11, 2011  
E-mail from Caycee Holt, Save Richmond Beach received May 25, 2011  
E-mail from Caycee Holt, Save Richmond Beach received July 29, 2011  
Letter from George Mauer dated March 25, 2011\  
E-mail from Frank & Jennifer Kleyn received March 25, 2011  
Letter from Kathryn Zufall dated March 30, 2011  
E-mail from Robert Hauck received March 31, 2011  
E-mail from Joan Forsyth received April 2, 2011  
E-mail from Starla Hohbach received April 3, 2011  
Letter from Thomas Whitson dated April 6, 2011  
Letter from John & Marilyn Boucher dated April 6, 2011  
Letter from Ken & Pearl Noreen dated April 7, 2011  
Letter from George Mayer dated April 9, 2011  
Letter from Mary & Dave Bannister dated April 10, 2011  
Letter from Pavel Sova dated April 10, 2011  
Letter from John Sherwood Jr., Peterson Russell Kelly, dated April 11, 2011  
E-mail from Lynn Manolopoulos received June 28, 2011  
E-mail from Ronald Trompeter received June 29, 2011  
E-mail from Gene Grieve received July 13, 2011  
E-mail from Joni Goetz received July 19, 2011  
E-mail from Ann Zinter received August 2, 2011  
E-mail from Robin McClelland received August 19, 2011  
Detail County Planning & Zoning Map & Aerial Photo – Parcel 270335-003-002-00

**cc:** Owner/applicant  
SCDPW  
City of Shoreline, Rachael Markle, Planning & Development Services Director, 17500  
Midvale Ave N, Shoreline, WA 98133-4905  
Town of Woodway, Carla Nichols, Mayor, 23920 – 113<sup>th</sup> PI W, Woodway, WA 98020  
City of Edmonds, Stephen Clifton, Community Services & Economic Development  
Director, 121 – 5<sup>th</sup> Ave N, Edmonds, WA 98020  
Save Richmond Beach, Caycee Holt, PO Box 60191, Shoreline, WA 98177  
File