

From: [Debbie Tarry](#)
To: [Tom McCormick](#); [Chris Roberts](#); [Shari Winstead](#); [Keith Scully](#); [Doris McConnell](#); [Will Hall](#); [Jesse Salomon](#); [Keith McGlashan](#)
Cc: [Kendra Dedinsky](#); [Margaret King](#); [Bill Willard](#); [John John](#); [Tom Mailhot](#); [Jerry Patterson](#); [Julie Ainsworth-Taylor](#); [Steve Szafran](#); [Randy Witt](#); [Heidi Costello](#); [John Norris](#)
Subject: RE: Staff's last-minute idea - a 0.65 V/C ratio
Date: Monday, June 13, 2016 4:00:31 PM
Importance: High

Just in case you read the previous e-mail Amendment #17 is slightly revised with this e-mail.
Council –

Kendra, Randy and I just concluded our meeting with Tom McCormick and Tom Mailhot. Based on the discussion I believe there is a better understanding of the proposed amendment and there was agreement to add language for the purposes of putting this item on the docket that is consistent with the City's position and helps clarify concerns of Save Richmond Beach and Tom McCormick. Ultimately the adoption of a specific level of service for Richmond Beach Drive north of NW 196th Street may result in added discussion and/or disagreement, but we all agree that data must be developed and analyzed (the point of putting this on the docket) to determine what staff's recommendation would be.

Based on the meeting I am making the following recommendations as they are consistent with our mutual concerns and consistent with addressing level of service issues along the Richmond Beach Corridor.

1. Amendment #7: Tom McCormick has agreed to withdraw this amendment. Staff had recommended alternative language if Council wanted to keep this amendment on the docket, but that is not necessary if the amendment is not moving forward on the docket. Since the Planning Commission had a tie vote on this amendment, and therefore no recommendation, **the City Attorney recommends that the Mayor just clarify that this amendment is not moving forward on the docket.**

2. Amendment #8: This amendment was submitted by Tom McCormick. Staff's original recommendation was to **NOT** put it on the docket. We all recognize that the issue of whether and to what extent Richmond Beach Road east of 8th Ave. NW will become three lanes is an open issue. Staff **SUPPORTS** this amendment if Council amends the proposed language to the following (proposed revisions are in red bold):

" ...As a separate limitation in addition to the foregoing, the maximum number of **new** vehicle trips a day entering the City's road network from/to Point Wells **at full buildout** shall not exceed the spare capacity of Richmond Beach Road **west of 8th Ave NW** under the City's .90 V/C standard based on Richmond Beach Road being a 3-lane road (the .90 V/C standard may not be exceeded at any location **west of 8th Ave NW** along Richmond Beach Road).

3. Amendment #9: Save Richmond Beach has agreed to drop this amendment. The Planning Commission did not recommend that this amendment be included on the docket and therefore Council does not have to take any further action from the main motion regarding this amendment.

4. **Amendment #10:** Save Richmond Beach has agreed to drop this amendment. The Planning Commission recommended that this amendment be included in the docket, while staff recommended it not be placed on the docket. Given that the Planning Commission recommended that it be included **removing this from the docket will require that a Councilmember make an amendment to the main motion to remove from the docket.**

5. **Amendment #17:** Although Tom McCormick and SRB are not agreeing to the 0.65 V/C standard or the assumed improved capacity of 700 vehicles per hour per lane, both agree that Amendment #17 deserves to be docketed and studied and then all parties will assess their positions. Below is the revised language of the amendment with the language added to the original staff recommendation in bold red: Adopt a volume to capacity (V/C) ratio of 0.65 or lower for Richmond Beach Drive north of NW 196th Street, assuming a roadway capacity of 700 vehicles per hour per lane for an improved roadway consistent with pedestrian and bike standards **and a V/C not to exceed 0.90 on Richmond Beach Road, measured at any point, west of 8th Ave NW assuming a three-lane roadway consistent with the City's Transportation Master Plan and Capital Improvement Plan. The applicable V/C standards shall not be exceeded on either of these road segments.**

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

From: Tom McCormick [mailto:tommccormick@mac.com]
Sent: Monday, June 13, 2016 10:07 AM
To: Chris Roberts; Shari Winstead; Keith Scully; Doris McConnell; Will Hall; Jesse Salomon; Keith McGlashan
Cc: Debbie Tarry; Kendra Dedinsky; Margaret King; Bill Willard; John John; Tom Mailhot; Jerry Patterson; Tom McCormick
Subject: Staff's last-minute idea - a 0.65 V/C ratio

Council Members:

Per the City Manager's June 8 memo to you, she wants you to move to add the following last-minute amendment to the 2016 Comprehensive Plan Docket:

"Adopt a volume to capacity (V/C) ratio of 0.65 or lower for Richmond Beach Drive north of NW 196th Street, assuming a roadway capacity of 700 vehicles per hour per lane for an improved roadway consistent with pedestrian and bike standards."

According to the City Manager's memo, "Staff believes that setting [such] a Volume to Capacity ratio (V/C Ratio) ... would be in line with the size of development envisioned in the City's adopted Point Wells Subarea Plan."

PLEASE SAY NO: Please reject the City Manager's last-minute effort to raise the current ADT limit for Richmond Beach Drive and cause other City standards to be violated.

Any effort by Staff to reduce the traffic allowed on Richmond Beach Drive is welcomed, and we appreciate the effort. However, if we look at the math closely, the 0.65 V/C ratio that Staff is proposing allows more traffic than the City's current limits would allow. It allows more traffic on Richmond Beach Drive than both the existing 4,000 average daily trip (ADT) limit and the previous 8,250 ADT limit, and it is barely less than the 11,587 ADT limit agreed to in the MOU. It would also allow a volume of traffic that would exceed the spare capacity of Richmond Beach Road once it is converted to a 3-lane road west of 8th Ave NW—a spare capacity of 5,000 ADTs.

Staff's last-minute idea is extremely disappointing. It'll make BSRE quite happy, but not the residents in Richmond Beach, Innis Ardin, Hillwood, Richmond Highlands and other Shoreline communities. Staff's last-minute idea would allow far too much traffic. Far more traffic than current limits would allow.

Specific objections:

I.

Staff's last-minute, BSRE-friendly proposal assumes a roadway capacity of 700 vehicles per hour per lane.

A FAULTY ASSUMPTION. Richmond Beach Drive from 195th to 205th is a 2,600-foot residential street that dead-ends at Point Wells. It is a curving dead-end residential street accessed by 29 residential driveways, five dead-end streets, and five non-dead-end streets (199th, 198th, 197th, 196th). A dead-end residential street with these characteristics does not have a capacity of 700 vehicles per hour per lane, even for an improved roadway. (Note that Staff has said that in its unimproved state, Richmond Beach Drive has a current capacity of 600 vehicles per hour per lane).

We strongly disagree with Staff's capacity assumptions for Richmond Beach Drive. Roadway capacity for a 2-lane dead-end residential street is far less than the capacity of a 2-lane arterial street. Staff has said that since the arterial 8th Ave NW has capacity of 600 vehicles per hour per lane, then so too should Richmond Beach Drive because it is also two lanes. To protect the livability of neighborhoods, residential streets have lower volume limits than arterials like 8th Ave NW. See, for example, the ADT limits for residential streets set by the City of Bowie and the City of West Sacramento (PDF attached). Also, City of Shoreline Staff has previously indicated that local streets like Richmond Beach Drive have a limited capacity of about 1,500 trips/day, which translates to a roadway capacity of about 90 vehicles per hour per lane, not 600 or 700 vehicles per hour per lane. In a 10/23/2012 SEPA Notification letter to residents who submitted concerns about the new multi-family development at 152nd street, Tricia Juhnke, City Engineer, conveyed the City's determination that there was not an adequate traffic impact by the development to require traffic mitigation measures. In the SEPA Notification letter, she stated that,

“Specifically, the traffic impact analysis estimates the project will generate approximately 200 trips/day that will utilize N 152nd Street and Ashworth Avenue N. These additional trips, combined with existing traffic counts of

approximately 750 trips/day results in a total daily volume of less than 1,000 trips/day. Ashworth Avenue N is classified as a local street. One typical characteristic of Local Streets is that they have the capacity to safely handle 1,500 trips/day.”

Also note that the City’s Transportation Master Plan at Table 2.1 says that the typical Shoreline local street like Richmond Beach Drive has less than 3,000 average daily trips, which translates to to a roadway capacity of about 180 vehicles per hour per lane, not 600 or 700 vehicles per hour per lane.

For the above reasons, Staff’s starting assumption that Richmond Beach Drive has a roadway capacity of 600 or 700 vehicles per hour per lane is unreasonable. A more realistic assumption is that, as a dead-end local residential street, Richmond Beach Drive has a roadway capacity of about 90-180 vehicles per hour per lane.

II.

We ask that Council refuse to place Staff’s last-minute idea on the docket. As proposed, it would set an exceedingly high volume to capacity (V/C) ratio of up to 0.65 for Richmond Beach Drive north of NW 196th Street, assuming a roadway capacity of 700 vehicles per hour per lane.

As a threshold matter, we ask council to reject Staff’s last-minute idea because the Planning Commission was never given the opportunity to review and vote on it at a public meeting. SMC 20.30.340(C)(4)(c) provides that: "The Planning Commission shall review the preliminary docket at a publicly noticed meeting and make a recommendation on the preliminary docket to the City Council each year."

Next, we ask that Council refuse to place Staff’s last-minute idea on the docket, because it increases substantially the current 4,000 ADT traffic limit for Richmond Beach Drive. Placing Staff’s last-minute idea on the docket would violate Resolution 377, which Council adopted on September 21, 2015: "Until such time as policy PW-12 of the Point Wells Subarea Plan is repealed or amended by the City Council, **the City shall not take any action** or enter into any agreement, arrangement, or understanding **that is inconsistent with the 4,000 vehicle trips per day limit** set out in PW-12"

Here’s the math that demonstrates why Staff’s last-minute idea would impermissibly allow far more traffic on Richmond Beach Drive than the current 4,000 ADT limit:

Per Staff’s assumption, the capacity of an improved (mitigated) Richmond Beach Drive is 700 vehicles per hour per lane (see above for our objections to this assumption). If a 0.65 V/C standard applies to that capacity, it results in an effective peak PM hour limit of 455 trips going north to Point Wells (= 0.65 X 700).

Assuming 60% of the total two-directional trips head north to Point Wells in the peak PM hour (an assumption the City uses), then the total two-directional peak PM trips would be 758 trips (= 455 ÷ 0.60). That translates to about 9,475 ADTs on Richmond Beach Drive, using a rule of thumb that two-directional peak PM trips are about 8% of ADTs, which is the percentage commonly found throughout

the City ($8\% \times 9,475 = 758$).

Council members, please do not violate Resolution 377. Please do not place Staff's last-minute idea on the docket. It increases substantially the current 4,000 ADT traffic limit for Richmond Beach Drive—it would allow about 9,475 trips on Richmond Beach Drive as the above math demonstrates.

I imagine that BSRE would be delighted with a cap of 9,475 ADTs for Richmond Beach Drive, as it allows more traffic on Richmond Beach Drive than both the existing 4,000 ADT limit and the previous 8,250 ADT limit in the Point Wells Subarea Plan, and it is barely less than the 11,587 ADT limit agreed to in the MOU.

Yet another reason to reject a V/V ration that would allow 9,475 ADTs for Richmond Beach Drive is that virtually all of those 9,475 ADTs will head east up the hill on Richmond Beach Road and will greatly exceed the spare capacity of Richmond Beach Road once it is converted to a 3-lane road west of 8th Ave NW—a spare capacity of roughly 5,000 ADTs.

We have heard Staff and Council Members say that there is little that can be done to limit traffic from the proposed Point Wells development located outside the City's borders. In response, we say that there is much that Council can do, starting with the following:

- Refuse to put Staff's last-minute idea on the docket. It not only violates Resolution 377, but it also allows far more traffic than residential streets typically allow, and it exceeds several existing City limits as discussed above.
- Follow the Planning Commission's unanimous recommendation, and place proposed Amendment #8 on the Comprehensive Plan Docket, then later this year adopt the Amendment. Amendment #8 memorializes that Richmond Beach Road will be converted to a 3-lane road, and it makes clear that the City's current 0.90 V/C ratio (and not a higher ratio) applies to Richmond Beach Road, and that the V/C ratio must be satisfied all along Richmond Beach Road and not just near intersections. No staff time or other costs will be incurred to docket and approve Amendment #8.
- Direct Staff to defend the City's 4,000 ADT limit for Richmond Beach Drive, and not seek any further City-BSRE joint extensions of the GMHB proceedings involving BSRE's challenge to the 4,000 ADT limit. The deadline for the next extension request is July 15, 2016. Please direct Staff not to not apply for a 22nd extension.
- Notwithstanding all of the above, if Council wishes to consider adopting a special V/C ratio for Richmond Beach Drive, then consider these two alternatives in lieu of Staff's last-minute idea (neither of these alternatives would violate Resolution 377):

1. We would not object to a V/C ratio of 0.30, if it assumes a roadway capacity slightly under 700 vehicles per hour per lane. That would equate to about 4,000 average daily trips, matching the

current 4,000 ADT limit in the Point Wells Subarea Plan.

2. We would not object to a V/C ratio of 0.65, if it assumes a roadway capacity of about 90-180 vehicles per hour per lane (see above discussion of how the 90-180 vehicles per hour per lane limit is calculated). A V/C ratio of 0.65 with a roadway capacity of about 90-180 vehicles per hour per lane would equate to 975-1,975 average daily trips.

Thank you.

Tom McCormick

PS: We expect that, because of an actual or perceived conflict of interest, Councilman Hall will recuse himself on all matters pertaining to the Point Wells Subarea Plan, and that other Council members will insist on his recusal due to Mr. Hall's past and ongoing roles at Snohomish County that have involved and continue to involve Point Wells. Snohomish County is in many ways is the City's adversary regarding Point Wells—for example, the County will derive revenues from Point Wells while the City suffers the impacts.

===