

From: [Debbie Tarry](#)
To: [Carolyn Wurdeman](#); [Chris Roberts](#); [Doris McConnell](#); [Jesse Salomon](#); [John Norris](#); [Keith McGlashan](#); [Keith Scully](#); [Shari Winstead](#); [Will Hall](#)
Cc: [Steve Szafran](#); [Margaret King](#); [Julie Ainsworth-Taylor](#); [Rachael Markle](#); [Kendra Dedinsky](#); [Heidi Costello](#)
Subject: FW: Response to Comp Plan amendments
Date: Friday, June 10, 2016 2:37:17 PM

Council –

Councilmember McConnell requested written responses to each of these items. Please see in red below.

Debbie Tarry
City Manager
City of Shoreline
17500 Midvale Ave N.
Shoreline, WA 98133

From: tmailhot@frontier.com [mailto:tmailhot@frontier.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 09, 2016 11:02 AM
To: Chris Roberts; Doris McConnell; Shari Winstead; Will Hall; Jesse Salomon; Keith McGlashan; Keith Scully
Cc: Debbie Tarry; Tom McCormick
Subject: Response to Comp Plan amendments

I wanted to give a quick response to the City's recommendations on the three Comp Plan amendments offered by Save Richmond Beach so you would have a chance to think about it prior to the meeting this coming Monday.

Amendment #6 (Policy PW-1) - If a second access road through Woodway is constructed, change the City's FSAA for Point Wells to include just the area west of the BNSF railroad tracks.

City staff says this is premature because the the second access road is uncertain. By that standard, the entire Point Wells Subarea Plan is premature since any development of Point Wells is uncertain.

City staff says this change should be evaluated in consultation with other stakeholders. Snohomish County has repeatedly made it clear that they will oppose annexation of the entire site by Shoreline. This change recognizes that the most likely path to annexation for Shoreline is joint annexation with Woodway. We should face that reality and start the discussions with Woodway and Snohomish County to determine whether joint annexation is a more viable option. There is no reason to wait any longer.

Response: Staff continues to recommend that this amendment not be added to the 2016 Comprehensive Plan Docket. It is premature to determine if lowland portion of Point Wells designated as Shoreline's Future Service & Annexation Area should be changed, especially given that vehicular access can only be obtained through Richmond Beach Road. At this time the project permit application is

still under review and the second road access issue is still under consideration. As stated in the City's Comprehensive Plan (Point Wells Subarea Plan) - Point Wells is an unincorporated island Snohomish County because this land is not contiguous with any other portion of unincorporated Snohomish County. The island is bisected roughly north-south by the Burlington Northern Railroad (B.N.R.R.) right-of-way. The only vehicular access to the lowland portion is to Richmond Beach Road and the regional road network via the City of Shoreline. The upland does not have access to Richmond Beach Drive due to very steep environmentally sensitive slopes that separate the upland portion from the lowland portion. However, the upland portion does have potential easterly access through the Town of Woodway via 238th St. SW. All of the Point Wells Island was previously designated by the City of Shoreline as a "Potential Annexation Area" (PAA). The Town of Woodway, and Snohomish County, have previously identified all of the Point Wells unincorporated island as within the Woodway "Municipal Urban Growth Area" (MUGA). The Washington State Court of Appeals, in a 2004 decision, determined that the overlap of Shoreline's PAA and Woodway's MUGA does not violate the provisions of the Growth Management Act. After a review of the topography and access options for Point Wells, the City of Shoreline excluded the upland portion from its urban growth area. Because of the upland portion's geographic proximity and potential for direct vehicular access to the Town of Woodway, the City of Shoreline concluded that the upland portion should be exclusively within the Town of Woodway's future urban growth area. Any people living in future developments in the upland portion of the Point Wells Island would feel a part of the Woodway community because they would share parks, schools, and other associations facilitated by a shared street grid. Applying the same rationale to the lowland portion of the Point Wells Island, these lands all presently connect to the regional road network only via Richmond Beach Drive and Richmond Beach Road in the City of Shoreline. Therefore future re-development of the lowland area would be most efficiently, effectively, and equitably provided by the City of Shoreline and its public safety partners, the Shoreline Fire Department and Shoreline Police Department.

Amendments #9 and #10 (Policy T44) - Proposed changes to the Level of Service standards for city streets.

City staff says both of these amendments should not be on the 2016 docket but should be addressed during the TMP update which will be part of the 2017 Comp Plan docket.

We agree, and only request that the Council formally direct staff to study these changes as part of the TMP update, just as the Council did last year for the similar Amendment #4.

Response: The comprehensive plan already includes policies to consider a multi-modal level of service which staff plans to evaluate as part of the 2017 Transportation Master Plan (TMP) update. This would include evaluating not only the impact of a motorized vehicle level of service (basis for the City's current adopted LOS), but will take into account other modes such as transit, pedestrians and bicycles. The proposed amendments to T44 focus on vehicular LOS only. If this item is placed on the docket then staff will be required to study both the multi-modal LOS and the vehicular LOS during the TMP process which can be done, but it means more money, time and resources to do so. Staff's understanding is that Council's previous policy direction is to focus resources on development and evaluation of a multi-modal LOS during the TMP update.

The staff report mistakenly attributed Amendments #7 and #8 to Save Richmond Beach when they were actually submitted by Mr. Tom McCormick. I will let him speak to those issues.

Response: Mr. Mailhot is correct and this mistake has been noted in a separate memorandum to Council.

Thank you,
Tom Mailhot
President
Save Richmond Beach