



Eastin, Darryl

From: Marion Woodfield <boekee1917@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2014 8:26 PM
To: Eastin, Darryl
Subject: FW: comments/concerns - Point Wells; 2/26 workshop

From: boekee1917@hotmail.com
To: kmckinley@shorelinewa.gov; darryl.estin@co.snohomish.wa.us
Subject: comments/concerns - Point Wells; 2/26 workshop
Date: Thu, 27 Feb 2014 20:13:52 -0800

Hi, last night's meeting was rather insightful and I shared my comments/concerns and possible solutions at table 7 but will try to summarize them here once again as a matter of record. I feel that my concerns re. transportation and environmental issues are so intertwined that I really need to address these in one letter.

1. that the city of Shoreline is supposedly legally bound to provide access and services to Point Wells is something I find quite debatable when I read in Rachael Markle's 2/21 outline to Mr. Darryl Eastin (Snohomish County Planning and Development Services) that there historically was access from the PW site up this slope into Woodway.

Presently this is a rough and undeveloped road but it sure looks to me like this should be option # 1. (I'm sure that Woodway residents wouldn't like this one bit but they are in Snohomish County to whom PW belongs).

Option # 2

if Woodway cannot be held responsible for option #2 they ought to love the idea of building a causeway from Edmonds to P.W. - something Florida residents are quite familiar with and to help pay for it you assess a toll; people residing there would get a break.

So far I have not seen anything that even suggests this although many months ago I wrote to Rep. Ruth Kagi about it who responded by say that she found this 'very interesting'.

Too costly? how does anyone know how this begins to compare to the enormous cost of all of the improvements that must be made to accommodate the doubling of traffic volumes (cars, trucks, school and regular buses, etc.). Surely someone can come up with a # that will most likely be sobering.

Or how to do you assess the cost of loss of quality of life, air and noise pollution and surely significant losses in property values for many RB residents? Also: nowhere is it mentioned that the coal and crude oil trains that might be on the increase factor into this entire plan. The trains are noisy, spew out suffocating diesel fumes, constantly blow their horns day and night, add to safety concerns because of aging rail cars, people walking on the tracks, etc.)

FYI - I used to live on NW 195th St. - you cannot sit outside without being drowned out by traffic noise

Re. train safety concerns I see one possible solution:

BNF should install fences all along the most heavily impacted areas and in order to prevent having to make any add'l stops because of the Edmonds ferry and disrupt their train service even more they should pay the cost of a tunnel or overpass.

2. based on what I have read thus far the issue of having to cross BNF rail tracks has been somewhat addressed and it will have to be addressed whether PW is connected out of Woodway, Richmond Beach or Edmonds. I imagine that when's it's all said and done building an over or underpass will probably be a more likely solution to adding another crossing like the one at the Edmonds rail station. Having trains parked isn't a plus under any scenario.

PS - I'm curious: what's the distance between the Edmonds train station and the PW crossing? Many trains are about 1 1/2 miles long. Would the length of the train prevent PW residents from entering and/or leaving?

3. having the community size double is an extraordinary challenge at best. Having only one way in and out for probably at least 7,000 or more people is an absurd thought. We are talking about what amounts to a dead end street scenario where somebody needs to figure out right now what happens during an emergency - fire, floods, tsunamis, earthquakes, landslides and so forth. Who provides the service? who pays for it? As a Shoreline resident I would be totally opposed to picking up the tab for everything outlined up to this point when Snohomish county collects the revenue and we can expect a token reimbursement at best??

4. I noticed on the maps that while Innis Arden shows up in the impacted area there is no indication that the cut through traffic will increase significantly for this community when people want to get to the Shoreline Community College, or shortcut to Greenwood Ave, get to Sears/Central Market, bypass much of the Aurora traffic, etc. and subsequently will turn from NW 195th St. into 15th Ave NW onto NW 188th St. turn south on NW Springdale Place, etc. etc, etc. until they reach NW Innis Arden Road and eventually come out on Greenwood Ave. (now you are at 145th - voila, you have bypassed about 40 blocks of traffic congestion and lights). Perhaps I'm mistaken but I don't see this being listed as part of your corridor study unless I'm mistaken.

5. Roadway Design proposals for sidewalks, amenity zones, bike lanes, curbs, etc. don't really answer my question as to how much sense it makes to turn an existing 4 lane road into what amounts to a two lane road; you can't really count the addition of a center turn lane as a travel lane. There must have been a reason why Richmond Beach Road, NW 195th, etc. became a four lane road. I agree with everything re. adding a bike lane but completely disagree with the thought that a shared-use path for bikes and pedestrians makes any sense whatsoever for safety reasons alone while the amenity zone and widened sidewalks would be a must. Honestly? this is needed now. Presently 2 people cannot safely walk side by side (much less with their pet) when buses and trucks and/or speeding cars are about to pass you. The lack of adherence to speed limits and/or 4-way stops is stunning.

Every so often we come from Edmonds, go south on 15th Ave NW and try to turn left to get to the continuation of 15th Ave. NW. It's often close to impossible because people step on the gas once they have stopped at the Richmond Beach Coffee shop. Try this some time so that you can see what I'm talking about and what the future will hold under the kind of population growth scenario that may occur here. Reducing the speed from 30 to 25 is almost mandatory. People will still speed but the police dept. could write lots of tickets and might actually stop some of these notorious offenders.

6. Buses - the # of buses will most likely increase. The ones used presently are extremely noisy, especially when they drive up/down on the steep Richmond Beach Road. Why can't Shoreline have the same hybrid buses used in Snohomish County? They are wonderful.

7. the PW clean up raises a question about where this toxic stuff goes and who pays for that? Are we eliminating one polluted area and add to another?

8. how does the county intend to handle run off issues at PW? What will be done to prevent further Puget Sound Pollution?

This is already extremely long and I may have forgotten some of the points I raised at the meeting.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
(Ms.) Marion Woodfield