

From: [Debbie Tarry](#)
To: [Carolyn Wurdeman](#); [Chris Roberts](#); [Doris McConnell](#); [Jesse Salomon](#); [John Norris](#); [Keith McGlashan](#); [Keith Scully](#); [Shari Winstead](#); [Will Hall](#)
Cc: [Margaret King](#); [Kendra Dedinsky](#); [Julie Ainsworth-Taylor](#)
Subject: FW: Deleting Amendment #8 and the 0.65 V/C ratio
Date: Sunday, December 11, 2016 12:52:58 PM
Attachments: [20160609 Comp Plan Amendment Memorandum.docx](#)
[Item 8\(c\) City Manager Response to Tom McCormick.pdf](#)
[Item 8\(c\) Comments from Tom McCormick 3.pdf](#)

Council –

A couple of Councilmembers have asked for a summary of staff's recommendation on Amendment #8 and also language for a motion to remove amendment #8 from the Comprehensive Plan Amendments. I'll address the motion first and then the longer summary of staff's recommendation.

Amendment Language

I move to remove amendment No. 8, new Policy PW-13, from Ordinance No. 766.

Staff Recommendation

Amendment No. 8 was added to the 2016 Docket in June. I am attaching the memorandum that was included in the June 13, 2016 Council meeting regarding staff's recommendation to add this amendment to the Comprehensive Plan Docket. Staff worked with Tom McCormick and Tom Mailhot to develop language that everyone could support for consideration and that reflects the development envisioned in the City's adopted Point Wells Subarea Plan. The memorandum sets good context for the recommended amendment. Based on the additional discussions with both Tom's the attached e-mails reflects the additional language that addressed Richmond Bach Road west of 8th Ave NW. Although Tom McCormick supported putting it on the docket – he was clear that he (and potentially others) believed that a V/C ratio of 0.65 for Richmond Beach Drive north of NW 196th Street would be too high and would oppose a 0.65 V/C for this road segment. This is also included in the attached e-mails. All are from the June 13, 2016, Council Meeting when the docket was adopted.

The Planning Commission's recommendation mirrors the language that was proposed in June. The Planning Commission's recommendation **does not adopt a specific V/C ratio for either road segment, as that would occur as part of a future Transportation Master Plan (TMP) update.** What the amendment does do is adopt a policy that sets a "ceiling" for an adopted V/C ratio. It shows intent that the City believes that both of these road segments should have consideration for a supplemental level of service, and in the case of Richmond Beach Drive north of NW 196th - it is a more restrictive LOS than on other road segments in the City. As way of background, the City's current adopted Level of Service (LOS) standards include an intersection level of service (D) and for Principal and Minor Arterials a supplemental road segment LOS of a V/C ratio 0.90. The LOS is applied to peak hour traffic measurements.

The subarea plan for Point Wells sets a cap of 4,000 ADT, until such as time that the Council may consider changing this ADT based on the conditions in the Point Wells Subarea Plan, Policy PW-12, (a completed Transportation Corridor Study and Mitigation Plan as called for in Policy PW-9 and the

sources of financing for necessary mitigation are committed).

The intent of the proposed amendment #8 is to recognize that the City intends to adopt a supplemental LOS for Richmond Beach Drive, the 4,000 cap remains in place. Although the City's Traffic Engineer believes that ultimately the recommended supplemental LOS will be no lower than 0.6 V/C, the actual LOS, will be analyzed in the future TMP update. Again, it is likely that this V/C ratio would be consistent with the City's adopted Point Wells subarea plan.

It is my recommendation that Council approve the Planning Commission's recommendation to include Amendment #8 as part of the Comprehensive Plan amendment ordinance on Monday night. If ultimately the Council decides not to adopt Amendment #8, then we are essentially in a status-quo position with the current policies in the Point Wells subarea plan. Staff believes that adoption of Amendment #8 indicates that the City Council's intent is to adopt a future supplemental LOS that is unique to the Point Wells plan.

Deputy Mayor Winstead abstained from the vote on the amendment when it was added to the 2016 Docket. She has indicated that she intends to be consistent and will abstain from any vote specific to Amendment #8 on Monday night.

I am glad to answer any questions that you may have regarding this recommendation.

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

From: Tom McCormick [<mailto:tommccormick@mac.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, December 07, 2016 9:57 AM
To: Chris Roberts; Shari Winstead; Doris McConnell; Will Hall; Keith McGlashan; Jesse Salomon; Keith Scully
Cc: Debbie Tarry; Margaret King; Kendra Dedinsky; Tom Mailhot; Tom McCormick; Bill Willard; Jerry Patterson; John John
Subject: Deleting Amendment #8 and the 0.65 V/C ratio

Dear Councilmembers:

At Monday night's meeting, City staff asked you to support its Amendment #8 to the Comprehensive Plan, which would add to the Point Wells Subarea Plan, "a volume to capacity ratio (V/C) ratio of 0.65 or lower for Richmond Beach Drive north of NW 196th Street."

At the meeting, Councilmember Scully suggested that Amendment #8 be deleted. Presumably, Councilmember Scully's suggestion will be presented as a formal amendment to delete Amendment #8. Please join Councilmember Scully, and vote to delete Amendment #8.

I. The proposed 0.65 V/C ratio is inconsistent with the current 4,000 ADT limit for Richmond Beach Drive

In the Point Wells Subarea Plan, there is currently a 4,000 average daily trip (ADT) limit for Richmond Beach Drive.

The Staff Report discussing the City's proposed 0.65 V/C ratio (page 9b-13) has misled you into believing that, "this [0.65 V/C] supplemental LOS standard is generally consistent with the previously established 4,000 ADT cap." This is simply not true. A 0.65 V/C ratio for Richmond Beach Drive would allow nearly 10,000 ADTs — a staggering 2-1/2 times the current limit of 4,000 ADTs. Contrary to what staff has told you, the proposed 0.65 V/C standard in Amendment #8 is totally inconsistent with the current 4,000 ADT limit, and thus, Amendment #8 should be deleted.

In addition to the above, please note that Amendment #8 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"

Current City staff has stated that a V/C ratio is generally more defensible than the 4,000 ADT hard cap, but has not offered any proof in that regard. It hasn't offered a single example where a hard cap ADT limit has been found to be unenforceable by either the Growth Management Hearing Board (GMHB) or by a Washington court. Keep in mind that prior staff recommended the 4,000 ADT limit (not to mention an 8,250 ADT cap before that), and that the City Council adopted the 4,000 ADT limit (in 2011), and the 8,250 ADT limit before that (in 2010).

Amendment #8 could be salvaged: We would not object to employing a V/C standard on Richmond Beach Drive as a supplemental LOS, if it results in limiting traffic on Richmond Beach Drive to 4,000 ADTs. The way the math works, my guess is that the V/C ratio would need to be around 0.27-0.30; staff could calculate the exact ratio.

II. Inconsistency with Town of Woodway's Comprehensive Plan

The Town of Woodway's Comprehensive Plan, updated June 2015, includes a policy TP-11, "To maintain the Town's adopted Level of Service standard A, as described in the Highway Capacity Manual. This applies to all movements at all intersections and driveways onto Town streets." The Town's Comprehensive Plan states that the Town has "determined that one vehicle turning onto a street from a side street or driveway would experience a LOS less than A if the two-way major street volume exceeds 273 vehicles per hour. Thus, an equivalent corridor LOS can be maintained as long as volumes do not exceed 273 vehicles per hour."

The Town's 273 vehicles-per-hour limit applies to all of the Town's streets, including the portion of Richmond Beach Drive that is within the Town's jurisdiction.

A 273 vehicles-per-hour limit is roughly equivalent to 4,000 ADTs, the City's limit for Richmond Beach Drive. If the City were to adopt a V/C ratio or other standard that would allow more than 4,000 ADTs on Richmond Beach Drive, that would violate the consistency requirement of RCW 36.70A.100, and be subject to challenge. RCW 36.70A.100 reads as follows:

"Comprehensive plans—Must be coordinated.

The comprehensive plan of each county or city that is adopted pursuant to RCW 36.70A.040 shall be coordinated with, and consistent with, the comprehensive plans adopted pursuant to RCW 36.70A.040 of other counties or cities with which the county or city has, in part, common borders or related regional issues."

Summary

For all of the above reasons, please delete Amendment #8 and refuse to adopt the City's proposed 0.65 V/C ratio for Richmond Beach Drive.

As Amendment #8 concerns Point Wells and would amend the Point Wells Subarea Plan, I trust that Deputy Mayor Winstead will be recusing herself from the vote on Amendment #8.

Thank you.

Tom McCormick



Memorandum

DATE: June 8, 2016

TO: Councilmembers

FROM: Debbie Tarry, City Manager
Margaret King, City Attorney
Kendra Dedinsky, City Traffic Engineer

RE: Point Wells Subarea Proposed Comprehensive Plan Docket Item

CC: Scott MacColl, Intergovernmental Relations Manager

Council is considering which proposed amendments to include in 2016 Comprehensive Plan Docket on Monday, June 13, 2016. There are three docket items proposed by community members that address the transportation level of service in the Point Wells Subarea Plan or suggest amendments to the City's city-wide transportation level of service (Amendments No. 8, 9, and 10). Planning staff has recommended that Council not place these proposed amendments on the 2016 Docket.

Although that is the case, Council could still consider adding a docket item to designate a level of service standard for Richmond Beach Drive north of NW 196th Street that reflects the development envisioned in the Point Wells Subarea Plan.

By way of background, the Point Wells Subarea Plan (adopted in February 2011) articulates the City's concerns, interests, and aspirations regarding urban service delivery, governance, traffic, and impacts on adjacent neighborhoods and infrastructure in Shoreline. The Subarea Plan identifies the BSRE property as Shoreline's designated "Future Service and Annexation Area" and calls for an environmentally sustainable mixed use development of the area, although at a much smaller scale than that allowed by Snohomish County's Point Wells Urban Center zoning.

Previous amendments to the Subarea Plan did the following: a) changed the designation of a segment of Richmond Beach Drive NW north of NW 199th Street from "collector arterial" to a "neighborhood street"; and b) adopted a new policy that states that the City should not consider reclassifying the street designation until either Snohomish County or the property owner (BSRE) provide the City with a Transportation Corridor Study (TCS)

and Mitigation Plan, as well as financial and legal guarantees that the necessary mitigations will occur.

The City's street classification ("neighborhood street") itself does not provide any limitations for trips or restrict the size of any development at Point Wells. The subarea plan for Point Wells sets a cap of 4,000 ADT, but this limit is to be revised once the Traffic Corridor Study (TCS) is completed and funding for the mitigation is committed. If BSRE is willing to complete the TCS, meet the City's conditions and provide funding for mitigation, the City could consider reclassifying the street and lifting the cap.

In recognition of the City's expectations of future development at Point Wells regardless of the applicant, the City could also adopt a supplemental level of service for Richmond Beach Drive in the Point Wells Subarea Plan that is in line with those expectations.

BSRE submitted revised traffic modeling data to Snohomish County in May, which provided staff the opportunity to analyze the available traffic capacity based on our current Transportation Master Program (TMP) and Traffic Improvement Plan (TIP), and to determine the approximate traffic capacity available based on the subarea plan.

Based on that review, Staff believes that setting a Volume to Capacity ratio (V/C Ratio) of no more than 0.65 for Richmond Beach Drive north of NW 196th Street would be in line with the size of development envisioned in the City's adopted Point Wells Subarea Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

Council should move to add the following proposed 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.

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.

===

From: [Tom McCormick](#)
To: [Keith McGlashan](#); [Chris Roberts](#); [Shari Winstead](#); [Keith Scully](#); [Will Hall](#); [Jesse Salomon](#); [Doris McConnell](#)
Cc: [Debbie Tarry](#); [Tom Mailhot](#); [Kendra Dedinsky](#); [Margaret King](#); [Bill Willard](#); [John John](#); [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 4:43:13 PM

I too want to thank Debbie, Kendra, and Randy for meeting with us. It was a productive meeting.

Regarding Amendment #17, although neither I nor SRB is agreeing to the 0.65 V/C standard (we believe it should be much lower) or the assumed improved capacity of 700 vehicles per hour per lane (we believe it is too high), we both agree that Amendment #17 deserves to be docketed and studied, and then all parties will assess and voice their positions.

We discussed that the study will include multiple traffic counts over the course of a year.

The traffic counts from BSRE's consultant (DEA counts in 2014), and the counts that our coalition commissioned a couple of weeks ago, are both consistent with the City's six published counts from 2005 - 2014, all of which show an ADT volume of about 12,000 ADTs.

You can imagine our surprise when we saw the City's recent, much lower count of 9,764 ADTs for Richmond Beach Road. With a 12,000 count for Richmond Beach Road, the road's spare capacity is roughly 5,000 ADTs. With a 9,764 ADT count, its spare capacity would be roughly 7,250 ADTs.

We need consensus on the current traffic volume on Richmond Beach Road between NW 190th St and 12th Ave NW. Also, we believe that the counts to be used as a baseline for measuring spare capacity should be the counts from the months when traffic volume is highest, typically when school is in session—we need to avoid traffic congestion when school is in session.

Thank you.

Tom McCormick

On Jun 13, 2016, at 3:43 PM, tmailhot@frontier.com wrote:

This is just to confirm that with the revisions to docket item #17 and a clear explanation of the planned review of level of service standards scheduled as part of the revision of the Transportation Master Plan, Save Richmond Beach agrees that Council may vote to drop proposed docket items #9 and #10 from the final docket.

I also want to give a big thanks to City Manager Terry and to Kendra and Randy for being willing to work with us to resolve some of our issues through what was at times a contentious meeting. Their patience and flexibility is appreciated.

Tom Mailhot
President
Save Richmond Beach

On Monday, June 13, 2016 2:47 PM, Debbie Tarry <dtarry@shorelinewa.gov> wrote:

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, with the lower of the two.

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