

Point Wells Agency, Organization & Public Comments

Updated 10-04-11

Agency/ Organization/ Name	Issue/Concern/Comment	Review request	Received comment	Date	
1. SC Public Works Surface Water Management		Sent review package	No		
2. Snohomish Health District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments. • <i>(See 3/24/11 letter)</i> 	Sent review package	Yes	3/24/11	
3. DOE Shoreline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please send env checklist, development explanation, phasing plan & site plans for review • Please add (Patricia Lambert) as POR 	Sent DVD	Yes	3/22/11	
4. DOE Toxics Program	<p>SEPA checklist:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pg 66: Under list of required permits it lists Voluntary Cleanup Plan Letter of No Further Action. DOE is unlikely to address site through voluntary cleanup program. Likely Ecology involvement will address site under formal program. • Pg 10: Do not know if Level I & II Environmental Assessments have been completed. Remaining documents need to be prepared under a formal order of decree. Most likely course of action is an Agreed Order to conduct a Remedial Investigation/Feasibility study followed by a Consent Decree to implement a cleanup action plan. • Pg 28: Needs to mention environmental health hazards associated with site cleanup • Pg 18: Air emissions associated with cleanup need to be mentioned • pg 42: Transportation issues associated with cleanup not mentioned • Pg 15: This section and section on pg 23 needs to mention potential for a tsunami induced by the Seattle Fault, South Whidbey Is Fault, or other shallower faults in area 	Sent DVD	Yes	4/15/11	

Point Wells Agency, Organization & Public Comments

Updated 10-04-11

5. DFW		Sent DVD	No		
6. DNR		Sent DVD	No		
7. DOT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please sent hard copy of application packet as well • Can county provide a hard copy of the TIA study & hydraulic report also 	Sent DVD	Yes	3/7/11	
8. DOT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on traffic engineers review, added review time will be required requiring developer to establish a JA account • 38% internalization reduction (internal capture trips) is too high & unrealistic for the scale & location • SR99 corridor & surroundings are well developed, rich in amenities & services, which would attract more trips from development than its combined 120 sf of retail & commercial spaces. • Internalization reduction rates need to be documented & justified • Trip distribution figures should be revised & refined as project trips should be distributed to routes such as NE 185th St or N 145th St to I-5 • Both AM & PM peak analysis are required due to size of project & apparent directional traffic patterns • Only PM Peak analysis was conducted in TIA • Analysis for both NB & SB ramps at all impacted interchanges must be provided. • TIA only includes either NB or SB ramps at impacted I-5 interchanges such as N 175th St & N 145th St • We concur with the impacted project list on the long version form. However, based on above comments we expect the ADTs Impacting Improvement to change accordingly. This will require the form to be revised. • With close proximity from development to well developed area with services (<i>comment directly on TIA</i>) • 38.8 % internal capture trip rate in unrealistic (<i>comment directly on TIA</i>) • 32K commercial & 94K retail would not be sufficient to provide 			4/8/11	

	<p>services to 3,081 residents (<i>comment directly on TIA</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If development is not completed by the 6 yr horizon, then a different analysis for the final impacts should be provide for a realistic assessment of final condition (<i>comment directly on TIA</i>) • Table 5 trip distribution to Snohomish County appear low (<i>comment directly on TIA</i>) • Where are Table 6-7 referenced on page 7 (<i>comment directly on TIA</i>) • Figure 2 (Daily ADT Project Trip Distribution): Net new daily trips on I-405 on Figure 2 (Daily ADT Project Trip Distribution) seems high. Trips overestimated on SR 99. Trips on local streets west of SR 99 seems too high. Shouldn't there be trips on SR 520? (<i>comment directly on TIA</i>) • Figure 3 (AM Peak Hour Trip Distribution): Shouldn't there be trips distributed to N 185th St? Shouldn't there be trips distributed to N 145th St? (<i>comment directly on TIA</i>) • Need to include LOS analysis in 3/11 TIA report (<i>comment directly on TIA</i>) • Where is Table 4-5 noted on page 12 (<i>comment directly on TIA</i>) • Table 7.1: A number of pm peak hour of adjacent street traffic percentages are excessively high (<i>comment directly on TIA</i>) • Table 7.2: Three pm peak hour of adjacent street traffic percentages are too high (<i>comment directly on TIA</i>) • Due to high levels of impact & very directional travel patterns, AM peak analysis must be provided (<i>comment directly on expanded TIA</i>) • On page 22: VISUM should be VISSIM (<i>comment directly on expanded TIA</i>) • Table 7.2: Three pm peak hour of adjacent street traffic percentages are too high. Line "to Retail from Residential", 40% was used on Phase 2 & 3, 60% on Phase 4 • Table 7.1: Several pm peak hour of adjacent street traffic percentages are too high. Line "to Retail from Residential", 40% was used on Phase 2 & 3, 60% on Phase 4 				
--	--	--	--	--	--

Point Wells Agency, Organization & Public Comments

Updated 10-04-11

<p>9. DAHP</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Read the Cultural Resources & Records Research Review report for proposal and concur w/ recommendation for subsurface testing. • Subsurface archeological survey should be conducted as part of the EIS & prior to any construction • All surveying completed prior to construction including micrositeing & surveys for design changes • Complete cultural resources survey reports must be sent to DAHP & Tribes prior to FEIS & prior to ground disturbing activities • DAHP & Tribes must receive final cultural resources survey reports at least 60 days prior to ground disturbing activities • APE to include staging & laydown areas as well as roads, utility lines & building footprints & borrow areas. • DAHP will review reports & inform applicant when an excavation permit is required • There have been reported finds of precontact artifacts in the vicinity of the project area 	<p>Sent DVD</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>4/18/11</p>	
<p>10. PSCCA</p>		<p>Sent DVD</p>	<p>No</p>		
<p>11. Army COE</p>		<p>Sent DVD</p>	<p>No</p>		
<p>12. Edmonds School District</p>		<p>Sent review package</p>	<p>No</p>		

Point Wells Agency, Organization & Public Comments

Updated 10-04-11

Agency/ Organization/ Name	Issue/Concern/Comment	Review request	Recv'd comment	Date	
13. Shoreline City of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Until & unless a commuter rail station is included in the adopted Sound Transit budget, we do not believe the project can rely on rail service as a realistic mitigation. • Any commuter rail would also increase trips to Point Wells from off-site, so these additional trips would also need to be factored into the analysis. • Analysis of transit potential should be deferred until Sound Transit or Metro has adopted a commitment to such service; the mitigation measures can be reopened at that time. • Because Sound Transit 2 plan includes light rail station at 185th & I-5, it will generate trips on 185th. • Common route for access to I-5 is to continue east on 185th. The intersection analysis should include the two intersections on 185th & intersection at Meridian & 175th • Are not in agreement with the assumption of approx 40% internal trip capture. • More documentation & discussion is needed of the ITE & Bochner & Sperry reports • Do not believe Snoqualmie Ridge is a comparable site with comparable capture rates to Point Wells • It is not credible to think that residents at Point Wells would stray on site as though they were at edge of metropolitan region • Shoreline needs to have a better understanding of the Bocher & Sperry study before considering methodology & reduction rates of such magnitude • Further discussion is need on trip generation rates • TIA calculates trip generation based on ITE Minimum Rates. If TIA is to include minimum trip generation rates, it should also include maximum trip rates • TIA takes credit for historic trips generated when the asphalt plant was on operation. Please provide recent trip counts to calculate 	Sent DVD	Yes	3/29/11	

	<p>trip reduction credit, or documentation that county code will allow counting of trips from uses that have been dormant</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking allocation is a concern. Please provide examples of successful similar developments with similar parking supplies • Future traffic analysis should include a detailed parking plan • Trip generation for Beach Park (LUC 415) needs to be included in TIA • There is the potential to change nature of traffic on Richmond Beach Rd & Richmond Beach Dr. Future analysis should include AM, PM & ADT volumes • Analysis of alternative street section on RBR shows it could lead to traffic diversions & could result in intersection LOS deficiencies • Future traffic analysis should evaluate trip generation if proposed grocery store were to go out of business • Study area should extend up to 220th Ave SW • Please provide calculations for intersection proportional mitigation shares • Future traffic studies should describe proposed & alternative street sections • Elaborate non-motorized enhancements • Please expand on discussion of traffic calming measures & how they will discourage cut-through traffic • Shoreline feels that public outreach approach for the RBD corridor is the proper method • Corridor study for RBD to Aurora need to emphasis public involvement. Charrettes & workshops are essential • Shoreline concurs with Woodway TIA review comments. 				
--	---	--	--	--	--

Point Wells Agency, Organization & Public Comments

Updated 10-04-11

Agency/ Organization/ Name	Issue/Concern/Comment	Review request	Recv'd comment	Date	
14. Shoreline City of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County's traffic analysis must if there is enough capacity on Shoreline roads & Woodway to accommodate project's traffic impacts. • EIS should be scoped to assure that the project's traffic impacts to Shoreline are accurately assessed & what project changes or mitigations are appropriate • NOA incorrectly categorizes Richmond Beach Dr NW, north of NW 199th St as a collector. Road segment is classified in Comp Plan as a local street. • Point Wells TIA shows a projected traffic figure for this road segment 40% greater than the City's Comp Plan. • Traffic implications of the project substantially exceed the LOS & capacity of the City's road network. • Assumptions in TIA such as "internalization reduction" & capture rate" are unproved & overly optimistic. • County should scrutinize TIA assumptions and subject them to peer review. • Until & unless a commuter rail station is included in Sound Transit's adopted ST-2 budget, the project cannot rely upon rail service as a realistic mitigation. 			4/11/11	
15. Shoreline City of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short plat application is incomplete due to lack of a hydrogeologic report. • Talking into account the site's industrial history, depth of ground water on the site & proposed levels of clearing, grading & development activities, Shoreline believes a hydrogeologic report is required for the per SCC 30.62C.110 • Reviewing SEPA checklist & technical reports submitted for the short plat, Shoreline believes the short plat is based on levels of development consistent with subsequent UC application., The two applications are irrevocably linked and the short plat cannot stand 			3/14/11	

Point Wells Agency, Organization & Public Comments

Updated 10-04-11

	<p>on its own</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given that an UC application was not allowed until March 1 per the UC code and UC & short plat applications appear to be inseparable due to common development assumptions and environmental analysis, the short plat submittal was not complete prior to March 1. SEPA checklist indicates a hydrogeologic study is required for the UC application. Absence of the study should result in a determination by the county that neither permit submittal is complete and not vested. 				
16. Shoreline Fire Dept		DVD	No		
17. Woodway Town of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request to add Woodway as a POR Forward all correspondence & application material to Erik Faison, Town Administrator 	Applicant provided review package	Yes	3/14/11	
18. Woodway Town of	<p><u>Urban Form/Bldg Height:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall density & mass is far out of scale with the surrounding density & character of existing neighborhoods & density & scale must be reduced Height of bldgs designated as towers should be reduced to more compatible levels Specific view corridor analyses should be conducted from various neighborhoods County should apply GPP goals, objectives & policies that address compatibility with surrounding land uses when processing application <p><u>View Protection:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommend County require applicant to conduct a proper viewshed analysis of the site to evaluate how project will effect nearby current & future neighborhoods <p><u>Noise Attenuation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sound wall will most likely redirect & increase sound waves to east & effect existing and planned residences 		Yes	4/25/11	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend County require applicant to amend its noise study & address impacts to east properties & how impacts can be mitigated <p><u>Transportation Impacts:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Town’s traffic engineer has reviewed TIA & has prepared comments that have been previously submitted to applicant & County. Following comments were attached to Shoreline 3/29/11 comment letter: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Phase II should have 46,300 SF & Phase III 24,000 SF if health club is constructed in Phase II. Phase II should have 401 units & Phase IV 735 units. ○ Values for Senior Adult Housing add up to 296 not 317 ○ Amount of public space should be quantified as Park & the police & fire station should be included for trip generation & parking generation uses. ○ Please provide a code citation for trip vesting. ○ Should be noted that funding for future RapidRide phases is in jeopardy due to proposed cancellation of federal New Small Starts program. ○ Please provide LOS analysis calculation. ○ Research by Portland suggests that increase in volumes of 10 vehicles per hour is noticeable to residents & should be mitigated by traffic calming. ○ Our understanding that Shoreline does not use pro-rata share mitigation, but condition development that creates a LOS failure to mitigate the impact directly. ○ Unclear how increased bus service will be funded. ○ There is little reason to have CT serve the site. Metro could serve the site, but has reached its limit on taxing authority ○ Until state authorizes new revenue streams for transit agencies & revenue streams are locally approved, it is unlikely Point wells can be serviced by fixed route transit service • There will be significant increases in traffic volumes compared to existing levels. Traffic calming mitigation should be required on local & potential collector roads impacted by more than 10 peak 				
--	---	--	--	--	--

Point Wells Agency, Organization & Public Comments

Updated 10-04-11

	<p>hr trips</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing transportation facilities will be significantly impacted & the EIS must provide acceptable mitigation measures <p><u>Aesthetic Control:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Important to define how design will be controlled & administered as project phases progress over development period. Developer may sell off various portions of project in future to be developed by others Recommend County establish a procedure that defines when detail design guidelines/standards will be created, how they will be administered & by whom Recommend project illumination program be consistent with dark sky standards per Illumination Engineering Society handbook <p><u>Earthquake:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly recommend County seriously evaluate impacts to project from a strong earthquake centered in Puget Sound 				
<p>19. Edmonds City of</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Edmonds is concerned about potential traffic impacts from the development Pease include Edmonds as a POR 	<p>Sent review package</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>3/17/11</p>	
<p>20. Edmonds City of</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Hwy 9 @ 205th St/244th St SW:</u> Project will increase volumes potentially increasing the LOS to E <u>100th @ 238th St SW:</u> Development could increase LOS at intersection to D <u>SR-104 @ 100th Ave W:</u> 2009 Transportation Plan identified OS at intersection as D <u>SR-104 @ 226th St SW:</u> Development will create additional trips accessing SR-104 <u>3rd Ave S @ Dayton:</u> Additional trips will be generated along 3rd 		<p>Yes</p>	<p>4/9/11</p>	

Point Wells Agency, Organization & Public Comments

Updated 10-04-11

Agency/ Organization/ Name	Issue/Concern/Comment	Review request	Recv'd comment	Date	
21. Ronald Wastewater District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sewer lines not allowed under buildings • Manholes installed per district design standards • <i>(See Certificate of Sewer Availability form for additional detailed comments)</i> 	Sent DVD	Yes	3/21/11	
22. Olympic View Water District <i>(Pace Engineers)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>(See preliminary certificate of water availability)</i> 	Sent DVD	Yes	4/1/11	
23. Sno PUD #1 Electrical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District does not have sufficient electric system capacity to serve the load at full build out • Facilities will require upgrading 	Sent DVD	Yes	4/8/11	
24. King Co Wastewater Treatment Div	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submit const drawings to asset mngt section for review during design development • Contact Keith Keithahn 72 hours before commencing any construction 	Sent DVD	Yes	8/5/11	
25. Community Transit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appears to be a disconnect between the env x-list, TIA, Transit Compatibility Plan & TDM plan • Voluntary Trip Reduction program only includes bicycle facilities & reduced parking standards • Measures to reduce transportation impacts in other documents should be included into TDM plan • TIA includes mitigation measures not addressed by the TDM plan <p><u>Environmental Checklist:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pg 4: CT will not provide public transit on private property • Pg 3: What does interim on-site transit center mean? • Pg 46: How does project meet TOD standards if there are no guarantees transit will be provided on-site? CT has stated that site will not be served directly by CT buses 	Sent DVD	Yes	4/12/11	

Point Wells Agency, Organization & Public Comments

Updated 10-04-11

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pg 46: Assumption that transit service will be expanded to the site. CT has no plans to serve site • Pg 46: Shuttle service to express bus stops should be expanded to include transit center & park & ride facilities • Agreements are required if developer wants CT to assist with implementation of the Voluntary TDM program <p><u>TDM Plan:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Checklist includes additional TDM components not included in TDM plan • CT encourages County to require additional TDM components <p><u>Point Wells Development TIA & Expanded TIA:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited info on TDM program elements used to assist residents & employees to increase their use of ridesharing , carpools & transit • Plan should state if it plans on coordinating with local transit agencies for this work • CT is lead agency for companies that must comply with state Commute Trip Reduction Act 				
26. Sound Transit	<i>(Send DVD to Sound Transit)</i>				
27. BNSF		Notice only	No		
28. Save Richmond Beach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add SRB as a POR • Support & adopt City of Shoreline’s comments in 3/14/11 letter • Short plat application (1-101007 SP) cannot be considered complete for vesting purposes until March 1, 2011 per SCC 30.34A.165. <i>(short plat file)</i> 	Sent DVD	Yes	3/14/11	

Point Wells Agency, Organization & Public Comments

Updated 10-04-11

Agency/ Organization/ Name	Issue/Concern/Comment	Review request	Recv'd comment	Date	
29. Save Richmond Beach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please supplement SRB comments with the Final Decision & Order from the GMHB 			5/25/11	
30. Save Richmond Beach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Asked if a hydrogeologic report had been submitted by applicant 			6/23/11	
31. 39 th Ave Org		Notice only	No		
32. Spadafora		Notice only	No		
33. So Co Chamber		Notice only	No		
34. Verizon		Notice only	No		
<i>Tribes</i>					
35. Tulalip Tribes (Mel Sheldon, Chair)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tulalip Tribes concurs with emergency ord drafted by Woodway, Shoreline & Save Richmond Beach organization Ord will ensure a thorough review of the implications for the Tulalip Tribes of designation Point wells as an urban center Pont Wells is within the aboriginal territory of Tulalip ancestors & there are aboriginal village & camping sites in the area. Recently aware of potentially significant cultural resources at Point Wells property in form of archeological & paleontological artifacts including the possibility of human remains. Point Wells is part of the Tulalip adjudicated Usual & Accustomed fishing areas, including shoreline shell fishing area. 	Comment prior to appl submittal	Yes	2/9/11	

Point Wells Agency, Organization & Public Comments

Updated 10-04-11

<p>36. Tulalip Environmental Natural Resources <i>(Mason Morisset)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete archeological and anthropological survey of site done to scientific standards • Highly likely that there are artifacts of interest to the Tulalip Tribes • Site is close to the aboriginal Snohomish Village and Point Elliott Treaty signing area • Request that a complete EIS be done • Access to shorelines is subject to Treaty rights • Proposed conceptual stream and pocket estuary restoration is not typical of Puget Sound • Marine walkway does not allow for overhanging vegetation over upper beach. Reduced intertidal shading is mentioned, but reduction by marina is not mentioned • Proposed conceptual marina may be over eelgrass • Marina and potential passenger ferry interfere with fish and fishing operations • Much excavation would take place with ramifications on cultural resources • SEPA x-list and reports provide little evidence to support statements about negligible impacts of development and environmental benefits of proposed restoration • Relevant site specific information is absent in critical areas report • Aspects of restoration designs do not reflect natural conditions and potentially limit their use by salmon • Proposed use of groins is a concern • Shoreline development that blocks access to shellfish operations would not be acceptable without mitigation • Docks, breakwaters, marina structures and boat traffic from marinas may interfere with fishing operations • More information is need before final comments and concerns can be formulated • Government to government consultation concerning protection of treaty rights and archeological and cultural resources is needed before project is permitted. 	<p>Sent DVD</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>4/11/11</p>	
---	---	-----------------	------------	----------------	--

Point Wells Agency, Organization & Public Comments

Updated 10-04-11

37. Stillaguamish Environmental Cultural		Sent DVD	No		
38. Muckleshoot		Sent DVD	No		
39. Snoqualmie		Notice only	No		
40. Suquamish	<i>(Send DVD to Suquamish)</i>				
Agency/ Organization/ Name	Issue/Concern/Comment	Review request	Recv'd comment	Date	
<i>Public Comments</i>					
41. Bundrant <i>(Peterson Russell Kelly)</i>	<p><u>General:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Owner's road provides only access to Point Wells, they will be adversely affected by the development • Development will lead to increased traffic congestion in the Richmond Beach neighborhood • Development will lead to increased light and noise pollution, air pollution, traffic accidents, crime, & other health & safety hazards • County cannot allow project until conflicts with surrounding communities are resolved • Application fails to demonstrate how a large number of people & vehicles can get safely in & out of Point Wells site <p><u>Local Roads:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application should be evaluated in light of Shoreline's road classification & LOS standards • Richmond Beach Dr with a capacity of 8,250 cannot support projected 11,587 trips report in TIA. 			4/11/11	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed mitigation is an urban section (RBD) with parking on one or both sides is inadequate. • Allowing parking along RBD will create additional conflicts with safety and quality of adjacent residential neighborhood • SCC 30.66B.230(6) requires an interlocal between county & Shoreline. No agreement has been reached • Concerned about LOS & delay analysis for major intersections & feasibility of proposed mitigation measures <p><u>Inadequacy of Traffic Study:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic study contains several flaws. • The use of a report of an ITE report prepared to describe a spreadsheet tool for estimating trip generation that has not been adopted or peer reviewed by ITE is not considered accepted practice. • The Internalization Reduction assumption in the TIA is without merit & should be redone for consistency with standard transportation engineering methods. • Most recent PSRE trip generation tables should have been used. • The 4-step trip subarea model is inconsistent with latest regionally adopted base year model & trip generation tables. • Subarea trip model should be consistent with Shoreline’s latest Travel Demand model to evaluate local intersection networks, land use interaction & trip generation in the vicinity • Arterial capacity assumptions are not consistent with local roadway conditions or standards. • Evaluation of arterial capacity impacts should be recreated to correctly incorporate local street/arterial actual conditions & standards in the analysis <p><u>Lack of Mass Transit:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No additional mass transit at site is ensured by project application. • Functional high capacity transit at site will require not just new transit stops or stations, but also busses and trains to regularly serve those stations. • County cannot allow his project until commitments are in place from the transit agencies who will be providing service that high 				
--	--	--	--	--	--

Point Wells Agency, Organization & Public Comments

Updated 10-04-11

	<p>capacity will be in place prior to time of occupancy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed stop or station should be supported by feasibility study & appropriate SEPA analysis. <p>Completeness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> UC development application fails to meet all of the requirements of SCC Ch 30.34A & is incomplete. Transportation plan & traffic study are incomplete due to flaws noted above. Does not appear a signed affidavit that includes a written summary of the pre-application neighborhood meeting was provided per SCC 30.34A.170 County State of the Stilly: Stillaguamish Clean Water District 2007 Report shows Point Wells to be located on an area of high aquifer vulnerability. No hydrogeologic report has been submitted with the application <p>Safety & Availability of Public Services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on soil conditions, high liquefaction potential & identified seismic activity, it will be critical to analyze the engineering & safety of proposed structures & adequacy of evacuation routes. Point Wells site does not provide adequate escape routes in event of fire earthquake or other emergency. Poor access to Pont wells jeopardizes safety of surrounding community as existing access or escape routes become flooded with new Point Wells residents. Development has not planned for the provision of sufficient public services. Project designed for own fire & police station, but application does not specify which jurisdiction will provide services RBD is the only entry & exit point for travel to hospitals & emergency medical care. Internal streets will not permit more efficient access to these public services 				
42. Zinter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no access that is acceptable Land is too special to develop No urban development is this area 			8/2/11	

Point Wells Agency, Organization & Public Comments

Updated 10-04-11

Agency/ Organization/ Name	Issue/Concern/Comment	Review request	Recv'd comment	Date	
43. Goetz	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns regard access & public services for a dense development Shoreline school buses need to do a u- turn to pickup children in that area. Injustice to burden Shoreline with providing services for fire, police & road maintenance for a landlocked piece of Snohomish County. 			3/2/11	
44. Grieve	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Point Wells is an opportunity convert a hazardous waste area to a residential center All faced with traffic issues, there are solutions that can be engineered Assume there will be traffic mitigation efforts Edmonds, Woodway & Shoreline should not have special treatment as to growth Is there an ILA between Snohomish County, Edmonds and Shoreline as to traffic mitigation? How compatible are Traffic Concurrency Analysis between the jurisdictions? 			7/12/11 7/13/11	
45. Manolopoulos	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Asking to be added as a POR 			6/28/11	
46. Forsyth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RBD has washed out twice just north of my home is narrow & fragile RBD should not be subject to the increase in traffic proposed by Point Wells development 			4/2/11	
47. Kleyn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There have been numerous accidents & several fatalities along western stretch of Richmond Beach Rd High traffic area between RBR & Saltwater Park via 20th Ave Concerned about impact increased traffic on RBR will have on welfare of our family & pedestrians 			3/25/11	

Point Wells Agency, Organization & Public Comments

Updated 10-04-11

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If there is ever a disaster such as an earthquake that impacts Richmond Beach, the increase in population & traffic will lead to complications providing aid 				
48. Mauer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Against approval of development due to inequitable tax burden on residents of Shoreline & community of Richmond Beach • Decrease in vehicle safety • Reduction in quality of life for Richmond Beach & adjoining neighborhoods • Failure of county to meet regional & state planning statutes & regulations for proposed development 			3/25/11	
49. Crawford	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposed to scale of Point Wells redevelopment • Single road through Richmond Beach/Shoreline is insufficient to handle proposed volume of traffic • How will county provide the infrastructure, fire, police, and schools when the only access (at present) is through Shoreline? • County will get the tax revenue & Shoreline will get the traffic • How would county act if all the traffic from Point Wells was routed through a single street/neighborhood in Edmonds? 			3/2/11	
50. Franey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the impact development will have on children of this neighborhood who walk from neighbor to neighbor • Concerned about children's safety as cars travel through side streets trying to get around "grid lock" • Cars change the entire impact on a neighborhood • Why not make development into a state of the art retirement community and sanctuary? 			3/2/11	

Point Wells Agency, Organization & Public Comments

Updated 10-04-11

51. Psaty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Point Wells development would cause an undue tax burden on citizens of Shoreline who will be providing essential services without being able to tax Point Wells residents Development will cause huge safety problem Proposed high density development would overwhelm the access & make traffic safety & congestion a critical problem Opposed to Point Wells project as it currently stands 			3/3/11	
52. Martin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Neighborhood is quiet. There are few sidewalks & much pedestrian traffic. It works because traffic slow & is well managed by current system If Point Wells were developed, the number of cars would more than double. The current design for traffic would need to be changed, adding stop lights at every major intersection. Sidewalks would need to be added to keep pedestrian safe Accidents would increase drastically Cost to maintain roads; water, sewer & electrical lines; support increase in school attendance; manage influx of new residents; crime & demands on emergency personnel would fall to King County & Shoreline Tax revenue would go to county. This is an inequitable situation & an undue burden on Richmond & Shoreline Roads cannot accommodate Point Wells Infrastructure cannot support Point Wells Can't see how development can fit in our community, especially when road to development is a narrow undivided road with no shoulders to expand. 			3/8/11	
53. McClelland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contact info for POR 			8/19/11	
54. Trompeter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add as a POR 			6/29/11	

Point Wells Agency, Organization & Public Comments

Updated 10-04-11

55. Zufall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is too large for its location • Only access is a two lane road through Shoreline • Traffic , noise, & congestion will have a significant adverse impact on Richmond Beach 			3/30/11	
Agency/ Organization/ Name	Issue/Concern/Comment	Review request	Recv'd comment	Date	
56. Hohbach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planned mixed use project is in direct conflict with infrastructure & character of Richmond Beach community • Current local services & roadways are not sufficient for thousands of people who will reside & conduct business at project • Mitigation measures cannot adequately contain impacts on community & no plan can handle increased traffic • Project would create safety hazardous for pedestrians, bicyclists, & motorists • Cannot re-design or make streets safer with mitigation • Most redoubling aspect is lack of entry or exit through Sno Co • Nothing fair about Sno Co receiving the financial benefits , but King Co taxpayers paying for the depreciation of resources & local residents suffering impacts • Not been adequate exploration why a roadway or tunnel can't be create for access through the north portion of site. • Ridiculous to think RBD (2 undersized lanes) can handle significant increase in traffic • Road was designed for truck hauling& has seen houses creep up ,on it creating dangerous conditions • Hazardous when pulling out or turning into streets • No mitigation that can rectify this situation & will be worse from the anticipated number of trips from development • Widening RBD to 3 or 4 lanes or adding traffic calming devises to assist or redirect traffic flow will not prevail • Richmond Beach residents will not accept condemnation by taking property for financial gain • Sno Co nor Shoreline has indicated desire to take property for 			1/25/11 4/3/11	

Point Wells Agency, Organization & Public Comments

Updated 10-04-11

	<p>public benefit by widening RBD or installing traffic calming devices in the area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing scope of project may not make sense to Blue Square, but is only way project should go forward, if at all • Industrial uses at the property have been in harmony with neighborhood & have not created any lasting uncorrectable harm • No company should be able to twist codes & over reach property rights when their proposal inflicts financial expense on a neighboring municipality & personal expense & dislocation to its residents <p><i>(letter attached to 4/3/11 e-mail)</i></p>				
<p>57. Hohbach</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No way Richmond Beach Rd can accommodate the traffic this project will bring • There is no mitigation short of condemning homes to widen the road that will fix RBD • Only way to ensure public safety is to create an alternative road for vehicle access or reduce the number of units & people on the property • There are no traffic calming devices that can be installed on RBD that will move the volume of traffic expected • Traffic circles or speed bumps will only impede flow of traffic • Two lanes of RBD are currently undersized & unsafe • Little room for pedestrian to walk on the east side & many homes abut road on the west • Any road widening will meet legal challenges & may be ruled unconstitutional • There are no current plans by metro or Sound Transit to include additional public transit to & from Point Wells • Wishful thinking that resident's needs will be served by the commercial tenants at Point wells site • Unrealistic to think people will pay high per unit prices needed for the condos to feel "locked in" at the end of the road • Residents will have cars & park them in surrounding neighborhood • If project is not scaled back, the only reasonable choice is an 			<p>4/3/11</p>	

Point Wells Agency, Organization & Public Comments

Updated 10-04-11

	<p>alternative road via the north</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Never been a clear message on why a new north road isn't an alternative access • No one has said a new north road can't be created • If Sno Co wants project, they can share the burdens & costs & plan it responsibly. 				
58. Whitson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to scale & impact to local environment and community, due to traffic, building heights & known existence of Native American artifacts • Limited county interest to engage impacted communities & provide leadership for an appropriate approach to Point Wells development • SEPA review should shed light on true potential impact to communities & lack of concern y county by providing an urban center designation 			4/12/11	
59. Sova & Chace	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to scale of proposed project & impact on community • Project will accommodate 3,000 units & 10,000+ daily trips • Majority of the trips will take place through RBD & then continue onto Aurora & I-5 or fan out through Richmond Highlands neighborhood • Concerned Richmond Highlands residents will likely be impacted by increased traffic • 25 mi/hr streets (6th & 3rd NW, Caryle Hall Rd & Dayton Ave) already have a lot of traffic & that after Point Wells development, the peak traffic will reach unacceptable levels • Streets are narrow & don't have separated sidewalks, but are used by local schools students and bicyclists • Scale of development will bring unacceptable level of hazard to all users • Exhaust & noise pollution will adversely impact neighboring communities • Geography does not allow development as proposed unless new high capacity roads are built 			4/12/11	

Point Wells Agency, Organization & Public Comments

Updated 10-04-11

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs to be a direct connector to Rte 104 as second alternative to RBR &/or downscale of project Concerned that planned project will downgrade character of our neighborhood 				
60. Boucher	<p><u>Scale:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to scale, environmental & community impact & legal procedure undertaken by BSRE Proposed urban center is not located in an urban setting & cannot accommodate the increase in traffic along the 2-lane, residential road, RBD <p><u>Environmental & Community impact:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community safety at risk by exposing neighborhoods to congestion & hazardous conditions created by urban center Concern expressed by community that Native American history & artifacts surrounding land will be negatively affected Short plat application acknowledges the urban center will have a direct impact on residents, including possible condemnation of property <p><u>Legal Impact:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legal objections are documented in reply submitted by Save Richmond Beach <p><u>Closing:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mr. Shraga has stated that he will walk away from project if it is not wanted by residents in Shoreline, Richmond Beach & Woodway Project clearly advocates in doing good (making a profit) for investors over what is good for the communities of Shoreline, Richmond beach & Woodway Consequences of project will be a long legal struggle & have a long term negative impact on the community 			4/11/11	
61. Mayer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose any access to Pint Wells development through Shoreline Already seen increase in traffic on RBR and its intersections in neighborhood at many times during day Addition of access for the development would place an undue 			4/9/11	

Point Wells Agency, Organization & Public Comments

Updated 10-04-11

	<p>burden on Richmond bch, creating substantial inconveniences, traffic & safety problems & result in decreasing property values</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to development should be created through Sno Co • If land through county is unstable, build a tunnel to Rte 104 at cost to developer • Idea of Sno Co imposing burdens on a part of King Co is presumptuous & insulting 				
62. Noreen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns us that decisions are made concerning our community by people who have no jurisdiction over it • Our King Co taxes have to pay for extra road usage & impact increased traffic will have on infrastructure • City is being built at end of cul-de-sac with limited ingress & egress. Now have 800 cars & it will increase to 8,000 • Two lane road will serve these 8,000 cars. We propose a light to limit volume of cars permitted on RBD similar to that at entrance to freeway • Disruption of Richmond Beach due to pollution, congestion, increased lighting & density will impact our community & decrease property values • Incomprehensible to allow 17 story buildings in area which is made up of single family dwellings. There are no buildings this high in a 10 mile radius • With the park like atmosphere of project & only 30 parking places, for community use, parking spill over on RBD will be catastrophic • Incredible applicant will be able to limit parking to one car per resident. Why would county allow this primitive planning • Point Wells Development has made no effort to build community relations 			4/7/11	
63. Bannister	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to scale of project as it is out of balance with size of Richmond Beach & Woodway • Object to egress limitations & traffic it will create in our small community including during construction & resulting residential & commercial use 			4/11/11	

Point Wells Agency, Organization & Public Comments

Updated 10-04-11

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to development for safety reasons with only one access in & out of Point Wells, in case of earthquake, landslide or tsunami, it would be devastating • Object as permits would currently be issued by Sno Co, yet majority of negative impacts will be imposed on Richmond Beach 				
64. Hauck	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>(Received undeliverable e-mail notice. Attached comments could not be opened. Sent e-mail 4/14/11 & 9/9/11 asking to re-send comments.)</i> 			3/31/11	
65.					
66.					
67.					
68.					
69.					
70.					
71.					
72.					

Point Wells Agency, Organization & Public Comments

Updated 10-04-11

73.					
74.					
75.					
76.					
77.					
78.					
79.					
80.					
81.					
82.					