

## Countryman, Ryan

---

**From:** Tom McCormick <tommccormick@mac.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, May 22, 2016 8:25 PM  
**To:** Mike Swenson, PE, PTOE  
**Cc:** Countryman, Ryan; Tom Mailhot; Jeff Ding; Gretchen Brunner; Richard Schipanski; Kurt Gahnberg  
**Subject:** Fwd: North-south traffic assumption

DEA's one-sided May 2016 draft Expanded TIA is fundamentally flawed. This is not surprising. The report has been prepared by DEA on behalf of its client, BSRE, the developer of the proposed Point Wells urban center.

DEA previously produced a flawed report on the infeasibility of constructing a second public access road, which report was criticized by Snohomish County. We assume that the County will reject the draft Expanded TIA, and require DEA to go back to the drawing board. Meanwhile, here are just three of numerous items to consider, all of which have been raised before.

I.

After Richmond Beach Road becomes three lanes to Dayton Ave. N., as provided in the City's budgeted Capital Improvement Plan, there will be no spare capacity. The City's 0.90 V/C ratio will be exceeded all along Richmond Beach Road with little or no additional traffic. While the City twice has allowed the V/C ratio elsewhere in the City to exceed 0.90, it is unlikely that the City Council will permit a V/C ratio on Richmond Beach Road to exceed 0.90.

The draft Expanded TIA must be revised to based its conclusions on the current 0.90 V/C ratio, not a speculative ratio that the City Council will never permit.

With three lanes on Richmond Beach Road and a 0.90 V/C ratio, there is little (if any) spare capacity. See attached spreadsheet from the City of Shoreline.

II.

The north-south trip distribution has not been validated, whether with or without a second public access road. See email string below. Without validation, how can the hearing examiner or anyone trust the numbers?

III.

Light rail stations will open in the City of Shoreline in 2023. Construction at Point Wells will likely not begin until well after 2023 (the hearing examiner will likely not hear the case until at least 2018; there will likely be numerous appeals after the hearing examiner decision is issued; after the appeals, the cleanup EIS and the cleanup itself will likely take at least five years).

The draft Expanded TIA fails to take into account traffic increases that will occur between now and 2023 and beyond due to the light rail stations and the new high-density dwelling units to be constructed around the stations. For example, the traffic at the N. 185th St./Meridian Ave. N. intersection will experience an enormous increase due to the 185th Street Station; coupled with a significant amount of Point Wells peak PM traffic traveling through that intersection, the City's LOS standard will be greatly exceeded. The draft Expanded TIA fails to account for the amount of Point Wells traffic that will travel through the N. 185th St./Meridian Ave. N. intersection, not to mention the traffic attributable to the 185th Street Station.

Thank you.

Location	Existing PM volume - scaled up to 2030 numbers from DEA Synchro Model	Directional Capacity <sup>1</sup>	Spare Capacity until .90 v/c reached (Peak Hour Trips)	Spare Capacity until 1.10 v/c reached (Peak Hour Trips) <sup>3</sup>
Richmond Beach Drive / n-o 196th	29	700	601	741
N Richmond Beach Rd / w-o 8th (3 lane)	623	960	241	433
<sup>2</sup> N Richmond Beach Rd / 3rd to 8th (4 lane)	833	1600	607	927
N Richmond Beach Rd / 3rd to 8th (3 lane)	833	960	31	223
<sup>2</sup> N Richmond Beach Rd / Dayton to 3rd (4 lane)	973	1600	467	787
N Richmond Beach Rd / Dayton to 3rd (3 lane)	973	960	-109	83

<sup>1</sup> Capacity for Richmond Beach Drive is based on a mitigated 2 lane roadway. All others come from Shoreline Model.

<sup>2</sup> The City of Shoreline has included a project in the 2015 - 2020 CIP to convert Richmond Beach Road (24th Ave NW to Dayton Ave N) from a 4 lane to a 3 lane section for improved driver, pedestrian and bicyclist safety & mobility.

<sup>3</sup> .90 is the City of Shoreline standard v/c ratio. The City has excepted this standard to a maximum of 1.10 for 2 street segments.

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** "Killingstad, David" <[david.killingstad@snoco.org](mailto:david.killingstad@snoco.org)>  
**Subject:** RE: North-south traffic assumption  
**Date:** February 2, 2015 at 11:45:11 AM PST  
**To:** 'Tom McCormick' <[tommccormick@mac.com](mailto:tommccormick@mac.com)>  
**Cc:** Gretchen Brunner <[gbrunner@eaest.com](mailto:gbrunner@eaest.com)>, "Brown, Mark A." <[Mark.Brown@co.snohomish.wa.us](mailto:Mark.Brown@co.snohomish.wa.us)>, "Countryman, Ryan" <[ryan.countryman@co.snohomish.wa.us](mailto:ryan.countryman@co.snohomish.wa.us)>, Jeff Ding <[jdjing@eaest.com](mailto:jdjing@eaest.com)>, Richard Schipanski <[rschipanski@eaest.com](mailto:rschipanski@eaest.com)>, "Mike Swenson, PE, PTOE" <[mike.swenson@transpogroup.com](mailto:mike.swenson@transpogroup.com)>

Thank you for your questions and comments. Under the scope and budget for the EIS, Transpo will be completing a review of the transportation analysis and assumptions submitted by David Evans and Associates (DEA) (I would also note that the City of Shoreline has retained their own transportation consultant who is reviewing the work completed by David Evans and Associates and has been providing on-going comments regarding the assumptions and results). Transpo is tasked to assess the technical information, analysis, and conclusions presented in the DEA transportation study and determine whether it is fundamentally sound and materially sufficient for purposes of SEPA review. In addition, Snohomish County will have final review and approval over the entire draft environmental impact statement before its release to the public. Due to the sensitivity of the transportation issues, the DEIS will include either an appendix or in the main document a full discussion of the assumptions behind the transportation analysis and model.

I appreciate your on-going interest and questions regarding the project. I must remind you however that we are in the middle of the SEPA process. As noted above peer review of the transportation work has not commenced and as such responding to your questions at this time is premature. I will make sure that Transpo considers your comments as they complete their peer review. Once the DEIS is published, the public and you will get an opportunity to review it and provided comments. All of the comment will be addressed in the Final EIS and any new analysis that results from comments will be incorporated into this document.

---

**From:** Tom McCormick [<mailto:tommccormick@mac.com>]  
**Sent:** Friday, January 30, 2015 9:24 AM  
**To:** Killingstad, David  
**Cc:** Gretchen Brunner; Brown, Mark A.; Countryman, Ryan; Jeff Ding; Richard Schipanski; Mike Swenson, PE,

PTOE

**Subject:** Fwd: North-south traffic assumption

David,

Here are more transportation questions pertaining to Point Wells for which answers are needed.

Thank you.

Tom McCormick

Begin forwarded message:

**Subject: Re: North-south traffic assumption**

**From:** Tom McCormick <[tommccormick@mac.com](mailto:tommccormick@mac.com)>

**Date:** January 29, 2015 at 1:36:04 PM PST

**Cc:** Scott MacColl <[smaccoll@shorelinewa.gov](mailto:smaccoll@shorelinewa.gov)>, Kendra Dedinsky <[kdedinsky@shorelinewa.gov](mailto:kdedinsky@shorelinewa.gov)>, Mark Relph <[mrelph@shorelinewa.gov](mailto:mrelph@shorelinewa.gov)>, Debbie Tarry <[dtarry@shorelinewa.gov](mailto:dtarry@shorelinewa.gov)>, Tom Mailhot <[tmailhot@frontier.com](mailto:tmailhot@frontier.com)>, Bill Willard <[bill@billwillard.com](mailto:bill@billwillard.com)>, Jerry Patterson <[jerryapat08@gmail.com](mailto:jerryapat08@gmail.com)>, Eric Faison <[eric@townofwoodway.com](mailto:eric@townofwoodway.com)>

**To:** Kirk McKinley <[kmckinle@shorelinewa.gov](mailto:kmckinle@shorelinewa.gov)>

Kirk,

1. The DKS Review Notes for 2030 Point Wells Visum Models reviews a 2030 Option H with 2nd Access (see snippet below). It assumes a road to the North connecting to 114th Ave W in the Town of Woodway. It assumes that 235 out of 974 PM Peak trips to and from Point Wells (= 24%) will use the 2nd access. Where did this 24% assumption come from? Shouldn't that number be closer to 10%? Please ask DKS to validate this key assumption, along with the 75% south - 25% north key assumption that I addressed in my Jan. 21 email to you.

2. If, using the DKS analysis, we assume 974 PM Peak trips to and from Point Wells (whether from one or two roads), then to calculate ADTs, if one applies an 8.0 multiplier that we understand is typical for the city, that would yield ADTs of 7,792 to and from Point Wells. Is this correct?

3. If, as DKS assumes, 24% of the trips to and from Point Wells would travel on the 2nd access road, then of the total 7,792 ADTs from #2 above, about 5,922 ADTs would enter and leave Point Wells via Richmond Beach Drive (76%), and about 1,870 ADTs would enter and leave Point Wells via the 2nd access onto 114th Ave W (24%). Is this correct?

4. The DKS Review Notes for the 2030 Option H with 2nd Access provide that the two-lane 2nd access second road will have a capacity of 300 vph capacity in each direction, yet Richmond Beach Drive is assumed to have a capacity of 700 vph in each direction. If both roads are two-lane roads, why is the capacity of Richmond Beach Drive assumed to be more than twice the capacity of the 2nd access road?

Thank you.

**Review Notes for 2030 Point Wells Visum Models**  
**12/12/2014**

**2030 Option H with 2nd Access** - Same as H and a road to the North connecting to 114th Ave W

- Lane changes - Same as H
- Capacity - Same as H
- New North access is 1 lane in each direction with 300 vph capacity increasing to 400 vph at 114th
- Distribution
  - Total Entering/Exiting unchanged
  - Volumes to/from the south (I-5, Aurora, local streets) remain similar to existing channelization
  - All volumes coming from the north on Aurora use 228th-Edmonds Way-226th - N Deer Dr - 114th
    - Most of these streets are very minor (1-lane per direction) except Edmonds Way
    - Of the 974 total, 235 use the 2nd access
      - On Deer Dr: 84 IB, 63OB
      - On 228th: 70 IB, 79 OB

DRAFT Memorandum – Point Wells Peer Review  
Page 2 of 2



**Table 1: Point Wells Entering and Exiting Volumes**

Volumes	AM Peak	PM Peak
Enter	248	589
Exit	591	385
<b>Total</b>	<b>839</b>	<b>974</b>

On Jan 26, 2015, at 7:47 AM, Kirk McKinley <[kmckinle@shorelinewa.gov](mailto:kmckinle@shorelinewa.gov)> wrote:

Tom. We have asked DKS to review the assumptions from the various runs over the past six years. We will provide that as soon as we have something to share. Thanks for your support. Kirk

---

From: Tom McCormick [[tommccormick@mac.com](mailto:tommccormick@mac.com)]

Sent: Saturday, January 24, 2015 12:18 PM

To: Kirk McKinley

Cc: Scott MacColl; Kendra Dedinsky; Mark Relph; Alicia McIntire; Debbie Tarry; Tom

Mailhot; Bill Willard; Jerry Patterson  
Subject: Re: North-south traffic assumption

Kirk,

Could you please let us know what steps have been take to validate the 25% - 75% assumption.

Thank you.

Tom McCormick

On Jan 21, 2015, at 6:01 PM, Tom McCormick <[tommccormick@mac.com](mailto:tommccormick@mac.com)> wrote:

Kirk,

Originally, the experts assumed that 60% of Point Wells trips would be to and from locations north of the County line, and 40% to and from locations south of the County line. Source: Feb. 2009, Draft Supplemental EIS, Final Docket XIII Comprehensive Plan Amendment-Paramount of Washington LLC.

A few months later, the experts assumed that 50% of Point Wells trips would be to and from locations north of the County line, and 50% to and from locations south of the County line. Source: June 2009, Final Supplemental EIS, Final Docket XIII Comprehensive Plan Amendment-Paramount of Washington LLC.

About two years later, the experts assumed that 25% of Point Wells trips would be to and from locations north of the County line, and 75% to and from locations south of the County line. Source: March 2011, Point Wells expanded Traffic Impact Analysis, prepared by David Evans and Associates Inc.

I've heard people say that a better assumption might be 10% north and 90% south.

How can these percentages keep shifting? Given the waffling history of changing assumptions, we have no confidence in the latest 25% north and 75% south assumption. We don't even know if 25%-75% assumption is the latest assumption being used in the TCS. The north-south assumption is a key assumption in the TCS. It must be accurate.

Please advise what steps have been taken by DEA, DKS, and the City, to validate the 25% north and 75% south assumption, or whatever the most recent assumption is. For example, have you surveyed current Richmond Beach residents to see how often they drive north, asking them to make a written record of their trips for several weeks? If so, have you deducted from their answers, for example, any trips north to and from the Harbor Square Athletic Club in Edmonds or the grocery stores in Edmonds (since the Point Wells development will have its own fitness center and grocery store, Point Wells residents won't be driving north to Harbor Square or the grocery stores in Edmonds).

Thank you.

Tom McCormick