

Countryman, Ryan

From: Kirk McKinley <kmckinle@shorelinewa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 5:17 PM
To: Countryman, Ryan
Cc: Nytasha Sowers; Rachael Markle; Scott MacColl; Kendra Dedinsky; Margaret King; Peter Hahn
Subject: FW: Point Wells EIS - Transportation Analysis Methods and Assumptions Memo submittal
Attachments: TM_15-0417_ Point Wells Transportation Analysis Methods and Assumptions.pdf; MOU.pdf

Hi Ryan.

Here are the comments we sent to DEA today on their methods and assumptions. Because of our MOU with BSRE, we are focusing on the trip cap leaving/entering the site, and the assumptions agreed to in the MOU for the TCS. Therefore, for this review we did not comment on land use, internal capture, transit/mode split, or other factors related to trip generation. As the approving agency, I'm certain that your team will scrutinize them in detail. We also are concerned about the need for a second access.

Thanks for your work on this. I hope to hear more about the progress on your end soon.

Kirk

Kirk McKinley
Transportation Services Manager
City of Shoreline, Public Works
17500 Midvale Ave N
206-801-2481
kmckinley@shorelinewa.gov

From: Kirk McKinley
Sent: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 2:51 PM
To: 'kaha@deainc.com'
Cc: Scott MacColl; Kendra Dedinsky; Peter Hahn; Margaret King; Rachael Markle; Nytasha Sowers
Subject: FW: Point Wells EIS - Transportation Analysis Methods and Assumptions Memo submittal

Hi Kirk. Here are the City of Shoreline comments on the methods and assumptions document. We have not commented on the traffic generation, land use assumptions, mode split/transit assumptions, nor the internal capture, as per our MOU the City of Shoreline is focused on the number of trips and the trip cap leaving the site. We also continue to believe that the site needs two ingress/egress points for safety if nothing else.

1. Please include the MOU as an attachment to this document, so that the reader (Snohomish County, etc.) can have the greater details should they need them. The MOU is referenced and should therefore be attached.
2. Pg2 – phasing years have been changed to 2020, 2025, 2030, 2035. This also means the background traffic growth rate needs to be expanded five years.
3. Pg4 – The LOS D reference needs to be modified to reflect the MOU: “LOS D for intersections with no through movement less than E...”
4. Pg12 – The MOU requires that the developer use Shoreline’s zones for modelling. It appears that this is not the case. Shoreline’s zones should be used.

5. Pg12 – Weren't the project generated trips consistent with NCHRP (not ITE) for the generation methodology and internalization?
6. Pg13 – We don't understand the statement in 4.6 about bicycle and pedestrian counts being used in future conditions. Please clarify. Will the base be increased .25% per year. This is also noted in the Attachment C table.

Kirk

Kirk McKinley
Transportation Services Manager
City of Shoreline, Public Works
17500 Midvale Ave N
206-801-2481
kmckinley@shorelinewa.gov

From: Kirk McKinley
Sent: Wednesday, April 22, 2015 1:52 PM
To: Debbie Tarry; John Norris; Scott MacColl; Peter Hahn; Margaret King; Nytasha Sowers; Kendra Dedinsky; Rachael Markle
Subject: FW: Point Wells EIS - Transportation Analysis Methods and Assumptions Memo submittal

Here is the methods and assumptions document. If it isn't attached, please let me know. kirk

From: Kirk Harris [<mailto:Kaha@deainc.com>]
Sent: Monday, April 20, 2015 5:29 PM
To: Kirk McKinley; amcintire@shorelinewa.gov
Cc: GHuff@karrtuttle.com; victors@tsinw.com; Min Luo
Subject: FW: Point Wells EIS - Transportation Analysis Methods and Assumptions Memo submittal

Hi Kirk and Alicia,

It has certainly been a while since we last met to discuss the project. I hope that all is well with you.

We are again working on the project and as part of this work I wanted to forward on to the City a memo that was just formally submitted to Snohomish County which outlines the Methods and Assumptions which serve as a basis for the transportation analysis.

Some of the information within the attached memo was included within the first two sections of the original TIA. We also wanted to include information that was outlined in the MOU between the developer and the City, as well updates with respect to how the ITE calculates internal capture and mode split. Thus we wanted to provide the updated

methods and assumptions in a standalone memo for the County to consider and approve, and then use this information to update the TIA and prepare the EIS.

If you have any questions about this document, please feel free to contact me.

Kind regards,

- Kirk

Kirk Harris, PE, PMP | Senior Associate / Project Manager

David Evans and Associates, Inc. | Transportation

415 - 118th Avenue SE | Bellevue, WA 98005 | www.deainc.com

d: 425.586.9782 | c: 425.922.1120 | kaha@deainc.com



From: Kirk Harris

Sent: Monday, April 20, 2015 5:12 PM

To: 'ryan.countryman@co.snohomish.wa.us'

Cc: Gary Huff (GHuff@karrtuttle.com); Gretchen Brunner (gbrunner@eaest.com); 'Schipanski, Rich'; Victor Salemann (victors@tsinw.com); Min Luo

Subject: Point Wells EIS - Transportation Analysis Methods and Assumptions Memo submittal

Hello Ryan,

Please find attached the Methods and Assumptions memo associated with the transportation analysis for the Point Wells Mixed-Use Development Project for submittal to Snohomish County for its review and concurrence.

If you have any questions about this document, please feel free to contact me.

Kind regards,

- Kirk

Kirk Harris, PE, PMP | Senior Associate / Project Manager

David Evans and Associates, Inc. | Transportation

415 - 118th Avenue SE | Bellevue, WA 98005 | www.deainc.com

d: 425.586.9782 | c: 425.922.1120 | kaha@deainc.com

