



Eastin, Darryl

---

**From:** Ginny Scantlebury <ginny@recsales.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 02, 2014 1:30 PM  
**To:** Eastin, Darryl  
**Subject:** EIS Scoping Letter about Point Wells

Dear Mr. Eastin,

Please add this letter to all the other letters you have received regarding the Point Wells EIS review.

This is the 2<sup>nd</sup> letter I have sent during this process and I am sending another letter because I want to point out some new and, I feel, important information.

First of all, I would like to go down on record as agreeing with the letters sent by the City of Shoreline (staff and city council members), Richmond Beach Community Association and Save Richmond Beach. They have all had important comments on this matter.

One matter which I think is VERY CRUCIAL especially in the light of the Oso land slide, is that the huge hill behind the Point Wells property is not very stable. It is quite obvious that the hillside east of the railroad tracks from South Everett to Seattle is not stable based on 16 mudslides that have occurred just this winter alone. This needs to be considered during the EIS study. You need to know for sure how stable that hillside is.

The transportation issue is also HUGE for our community – lower Richmond Beach I guess you could call us. In order to get off the street we live on, 27<sup>th</sup> Ave NW, we need to go over a bridge to get into the flow of traffic. If there are 11,000 cars/day instead of less than 1000 today, it could take us 20 minutes to just get off our bridge. I don't think it matters what mitigation plans the City of Shoreline comes up with to handle traffic. The main issue is that this is too much volume for a 2 or max 3-lane road to handle. This is not an arterial. Therefore, this project needs to be downsized.

Another huge issue relating to the transportation issue is the lack of ingress and egress to and from Point Wells. There should be a second alternative going through Snohomish County for cars to travel on. I have heard that the developer owns SW166th, a gravel road, which is supposed to be used for emergencies. Why can't that road be developed for usage on a regular basis? If even a 1/3 of the traffic could go on this road, or another alternate road in Snohomish County, that would make movement around lower Richmond Beach must more pleasant.

I will end with a few comments regarding your 2<sup>nd</sup> Scoping Notice:

1. The notice should have read that this is a "determination of **significance**, not insignificance".
2. Also, why did it take at least 10 days for you to let the City of Shoreline and/or residents know about the new deadline? I think we should be allowed to have another 30 days just based on this alone.
3. The notice on the scoping notice only mentions main topics. You should cover all the subtopics as well so residents understand the whole scope of the project.

I would appreciate your consideration of extending the deadline another 30 days based on the above information.

Sincerely,

Ginny Scantlebury  
19625 – 27<sup>th</sup> Ave NW  
Shoreline, WA 98177  
206-546-5627