



MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor Winstead and City Councilmembers

FROM: Jessica Simulcik Smith, City Clerk

DATE: June 3, 2014

RE: Documents received at 6/2/14 Council Meeting

CC: Debbie Tarry, City Manager
John Norris, Assistant City Manager

Attached hereto are documents received from the public at the June 2, 2014 City Council Business Meeting.

- 1) Public comment read at meeting by Guy Alloway (p. 1)
- 2) Public comment read at meeting by Tom Mailhot, Save Richmond Beach (p. 2)

Good evening. I'm Guy Alloway. A CPA and a Richmond Beach resident. I'm here today to read a statement from my neighbor, Tom McCormick, who couldn't be here tonight. I support the request that he is making.

===

Council members: I've recently reviewed hundreds of your emails, as well as minutes of many City Council meetings. You've expressed dissatisfaction that you haven't been able to do more to downsize the proposed development and its attendant impacts on Shoreline — impacts like traffic, especially traffic on Richmond Beach Drive.

One thing that you can do, *now*, is to direct City staff to immediately make available the Point Wells traffic analysis and related documents and files. I requested these items last week in an email on which you all were copied.

The City has been less than forthcoming about the traffic analysis. On April 15, Bill Willard, of the Richmond Beach Community Association, sent an email to City staff asking whether DEA, the traffic engineering firm hired by the developer, had "provided any traffic analysis for the corridor yet." Though City staff knew that DEA's traffic analysis and a memo briefly describing the assumptions and methodology was ready, and had been submitted to DKA (the firm the City had hired to do a peer review), City staff sent Mr. Willard a reply email saying that "the City has not seen or reviewed the DEA analysis."

So . . . despite knowing that DEA's traffic analysis was ready, and that City staff had access to the analysis, and the memo describing the assumptions and methodology, the City tells us that "it has not seen or reviewed the DEA analysis." Its response to an inquiry asking whether DEA had "provided any traffic analysis for the corridor yet," is disingenuous.

Shoreline residents have a vested interest in challenging the reasonableness of the traffic analysis and its assumptions, particularly if the analysis concludes that Richmond Beach Drive can accommodate a traffic volume that's ten or twenty times the current volume.

Council members, you will eventually be asked to vote on whether you approve or disapprove of the traffic analysis. Your vote gives you the ultimate opportunity to affect the scale of the development. Before it comes to you for a vote, wouldn't you want to make sure that the traffic analysis is fully vetted and challenged by as many people as possible?

I respectfully request that the Council adopt a motion to require that City staff immediately release the traffic analysis and related documents and files, and second, ensure that residents and any traffic engineers they hire are given ample opportunity and time to challenge the reasonableness of the traffic analysis and its assumptions, including future iterations of the traffic analysis.

Time is of the essence.
Thank you.

To: Shoreline City Council members
From: Save Richmond Beach
Tom Mailhot, President

June 2, 2014

I want to speak to you about two points this evening.

First, I spoke to you several weeks ago about our concerns that the Point Wells traffic corridor study must provide concrete answers to questions about whether the proposed mitigation would really “maintain and improve safety for all users” as called for in the TCS agreement with BSRE.

I want to emphasize once more that if the initial study results doesn't provide adequate answers to these safety questions, it's your responsibility to send it back for more work until it does provide the answers.

The developer says this is a billion dollar project that will take 20 to 25 years to complete. Surely we can ask for what measured against that scale is an insignificant amount of additional time and money to make sure the traffic study is complete and answers all the questions about safety on all the streets that will receive increased traffic.

We as citizens do not have the power to force anyone to answer these questions but you as council members do have that power and we are depending on you to exercise that power if it is needed.

Second, even if the traffic study does show that we can handle 11,000+ additional vehicle trips through the Point Wells corridor without causing gridlock and without creating safety problems, that just answers the question of whether it can be done. There's a second much more important question you should all be considering: is this something that should be done.

There can be no doubt that building the Point Wells project at its proposed size will irrevocably change the character of the Richmond Beach neighborhood as well as having large impacts on the Innes Arden, Hillwood, and Richmond Highlands neighborhoods. These changes will not be for the better. The neighborhoods will become less walk-able and less desirable to live in as what were once less travelled neighborhood streets become busy arterials as driver as drivers do anything and go anywhere to avoid the mess on Richmond Beach Road.

Over the last couple of years the city has consistently ignored opportunities to seriously negotiate with the developer for a smaller development, always using the claim that they have no leverage to convince the developer to make changes, a claim many attorneys have disputed. The city has even worked with the developer to prevent Woodway from getting more local control over the project, even though Woodway provided a written promise to equitably share tax revenue with the city. Why hasn't the city fought harder to make this development smaller? From here it appears that the city wants the increased tax base they would get by annexing Point Wells, and they want all of it not just part of it. But the question has to be asked: at what cost?

Each of you needs to carefully consider whether it is really in the best interest of the residents of the city, the people you are supposed to represent, to get that larger tax base at the cost of ruining four of the city's existing neighborhoods. You can guess that our answer is “No, it's not in the best interest of the city”. We recognize there may be disagreements about the answer to that question but if you haven't yet figured out a convincing answer on one side or the other, something beyond “there's nothing we can do”, and an answer you are willing to explain in public, you are in danger of not doing your job representing the citizens of Shoreline.