



Eastin, Darryl

From: Jerry Patterson <jerryat08@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 28, 2014 3:18 PM
To: Eastin, Darryl
Subject: Comments re Scoping for Point Wells Project
Attachments: Patterson comments re Scoping Point Wells.doc

Please see attached for comments by Jerry and Janice Patterson.

Jerry and Janice Patterson
20420 Richmond Beach Drive NW
Shoreline, WA 98177

February 28, 2014

Snohomish County Planning and Development Services
Attn. Clay White
3000 Rockefeller Avenue
Everett, WA 98201-4046

Re: Scoping and Alternatives Comments for Point Wells DEIS

.....

Please consider the following comments on the scope of the EIS as pertains to the Point Wells Project

First, we endorse all of the comments registered by *Richmond Beach Advocates* organization.

Second, we expect special analysis of the following issues re: the heavy impact that traffic will have on the permanent character and quality of life in Richmond Beach:

Unresolved issues re: Traffic Monitoring and Cap

- How will the TCS and/or any mitigation proposed therein or agreed upon in conjunction therewith limit development on Point Wells (via unit count, square footages, and mixes of use) to that which will not result in more than 11,587 ADT at full build out?
- How will BSRE engage in traffic monitoring and provide a traffic monitoring report, consistent with City approved standards and the standard practices in the industry, indicating, at minimum, actual traffic counts per day at the point of ingress/egress to the Point Wells development at the northernmost point of Richmond Beach Drive?
- What safeguards will be built into the process to assure that BSRE shall be precluded from submitting any application for a building permit if existing traffic counts indicate that the addition of the proposed new development is likely to exceed the maximum ADT of 11,587?

Unresolved issues for Traffic Monitoring and Cap

- What assurances will be provided that BSRE shall limit the unit count, square footages, and mix of uses proposed for Point Wells in a manner that supports the assumption of 11,587 maximum ADT, and ensures that the 11,587 ADT will not be exceeded at full-build out?

Respectfully submitted,

/s/

Jerry and Janice Patterson