



SHORELINE
CITY COUNCIL

Cindy Ryu
Mayor

Terry Scott
Deputy Mayor

Chris Eggen

Ron Hansen

Doris McConnell

Keith McGlashan

Janet Way

July 7, 2009

The Honorable Mike Cooper
Chair, Snohomish County Council
3000 Rockefeller Avenue
Everett, WA 98201-4046

Re: 2009 Final Docket XIII – Paramount of Washington proposal

Dear Chair Cooper:

Thank you for the opportunity to share our serious concerns regarding the Paramount Northwest Comprehensive Plan proposal to change the County's designation from "Urban Industrial" to "Urban Center."

The City of Shoreline is very concerned about the magnitude of impacts that a future "Urban Center" at Point Wells would have on Shoreline streets, schools, libraries, parks, and other City services. In April, we adopted Resolution 285 which expressed our opposition to the requested "Urban Center" designation, in large part because it would enable far too much development (up to 3,500 units with 6,000 people). To put it in perspective, that's more people than now live in the entire Richmond Beach neighborhood of Shoreline!

The City and our residents would shoulder virtually all of the direct off-site impacts from future development at Point Wells because the only way to access this unincorporated island is through Shoreline. Future development of the Paramount site will have no impact on any residents of unincorporated Snohomish County – it will affect only the residents of the City of Shoreline and the Town of Woodway. For this reason, we share Woodway's position that realistic and responsible future planning for Point Wells must reflect the concerns and opinions of the residents and the Councils of our two communities.

We also believe that such inter-jurisdictional collaboration is a requirement of the Growth Management Act, particularly due to the unique circumstances of Point Wells' location and access. To that end, we would welcome the opportunity to work collaboratively with the County, Woodway, Paramount, and our residents to reach a mutually satisfactory outcome.

Having said that, we also must candidly say that a County decision to plan and zone unilaterally for Point Wells, in a way that ignores our community's legitimate interests, would oblige the City to oppose the amendment by all legal means available.

The City opposes the proposed Paramount Plan Amendment as submitted

The City has reviewed the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (FSEIS) for the Paramount amendment, paying particularly close attention to the responses to the City's comments on the Draft SEIS regarding traffic impacts, the provision of urban governmental services, and availability of transit. Shoreline prepared its own traffic impact analysis (copy attached) to evaluate what we believe are the likely traffic impacts that would be generated by urban development of Point Wells. In addition, we have closely reviewed the relevant provisions of the County's existing comprehensive plan and the Growth Management Act (GMA).

Based upon our review of these documents, the City believes that the Paramount Plan Amendment, as submitted, is inconsistent not only with sensible land use planning, but the specific requirements of the County's plan and the GMA.

1. The Paramount amendment is inconsistent with the County's General Policy Plan

We believe that the County staff is incorrect in concluding that the Point Wells proposal meets the criteria for an Urban Center. The County has proposed a new definition for Urban Centers as part of Docket XIII. The new definition states:

These centers are intended to be compact and centralized living, working, shopping and/or activity areas linked to each by high capacity or local transit. The concept of centers is pedestrian and transit orientation with a focus on circulation, scale and convenience with a mix of uses.

The proposed changes to the Centers Section of the Land Use (LU) chapter goes on to state:

The pedestrian and transit-oriented design of centers helps reduce vehicle generated trips, especially single-occupancy trips...

Though the proposed language would allow an urban center designation if an activity center is located "along designated high capacity transit stations," it is clear from the definition of an urban center that the policy intent is to reduce vehicle trips.

The policy rationale for requiring proximity of commercial development to transit is to encourage people to access the site utilizing transit. While the site is adjacent to

the line, it receives no actual service and the nearest station is located in Edmonds, and no additional service is planned. That a commuter rail station located at Point Wells is not part of Sound Transit's current 20 year plan was documented in the SEIS:

Community Transit's letter dated February 24, 2009 states:
Conversation with Sound Transit indicates they have no current or future plans to construct a station at Point Wells and this possibility is not raised in their Long Range Plan. Further, passenger rail service on this corridor is peak-period/peak-direction only, oriented to the Seattle commuter market. An urban center requires the all-day bi-directional connectivity provided by proximity to a true HCT transit corridor. The base Urban Center/High Capacity Transit nexus is not established under this proposal.

Simply having a Sounder train rolling through Point Wells does not constitute transit service.

Nor is the site served by other types of transit, such as bus rapid transit or light rail. As the SEIS notes, the closest METRO stop is more than one-half mile away.¹ If the site is developed, the transit tax dollars flow to Community Transit, not King County METRO, so it is unlikely in the extreme that METRO would serve the site. Given that they would have to travel for several miles through King County to reach Point Wells, it seems equally unlikely that Community Transit would ever serve the site.

The other assumption in an Urban Centers designation is that an Urban Center would include a solid employment base; however the information in the SEIS does little to suggest that Point Wells would be an employment center of any note. The SEIS assumes a base of 800 jobs, basing its assumption of 27 employees per acre on about 30 acres. We believe that a more realistic way of estimating employment is to recognize that employment is a function of the retail and commercial space that is provided. Even with an optimistic assumption of 4 employees per thousand square feet, 85,000 square feet would result in only 340 jobs, which is about 40% of the job total that the SEIS assumes.

¹ The nearest part of the project site is approximately ½ mile from the nearest transit route. Metro is the only transit provider this close to the site. Currently, Metro has two routes that provide service in the vicinity of the proposed project. One is an all day, local route that travels from Richmond Beach to the Northgate Transit center. The other route is a weekday, peak only route that travels from Richmond Beach to downtown Seattle. (The SEIS incorrectly identifies only one route in this area - the all day, local route.) While the proposed zoning may result in density sufficient to support transit, there are no assumptions made in the SEIS that transit service to the site will increase.

Certainly the proposal would provide for a good deal of residential density. However, from the facts set forth in the SEIS, it is clear that Point Wells would provide for relatively little employment and no demonstrated opportunity for mass transit. The realities of geography and lack of available transportation facilities mean that Point Wells is not an appropriate location for an Urban Center designation.

2. The Urban Center designation for Point Wells fails to comply with the Growth Management Act

We believe that the proposed designation of Point Wells as an urban center would fail to comply with the provisions of the GMA, specifically RCW 36.70A.020(2), (3), (9), (10), (11), and (12); RCW 36.70A.100, RCW 36.70A.110 and RCW 36.70A.210.

RCW 36.70A.020(2) provides:

Urban Growth. Encourage development in urban areas where adequate public facilities and services exist or can be provided in an efficient manner. (Emphasis added).

Comment: The facts in the record show that “adequate public facilities services” do not now exist and cannot “be provided in an efficient manner” to serve an Urban Center at Point Wells. The Shoreline Fire Department stated in a March 2, 2009 letter (referred to in the SEIS as letter #6) as follows:

The draft SEIS does not adequately address how these crucial emergency services will be provided. In Section 3.12 the report simply indicates that the service should be provided by a Snohomish County rural fire district or the Shoreline Fire Department. The draft glaringly omits that there are no nearby rural fire districts that could possibly supply these services with any reasonable response times. This would leave the residents, visitors, and businesses at Point Wells with inadequate and seriously deficient fire and emergency medical services. It is well established that minutes and even seconds are crucial in quelling fires and providing life saving emergency medical services.

Due to the geographic isolation and extremely limited access to Point Wells from the rest of Snohomish County, there are no feasible and practical alternatives to provide critical fire and emergency medical services to the over 6,000 residents, businesses, and visitors projected for Point Wells. The response times to Point Wells from emergency responders in Snohomish County, under any reasonable professional standards or interpretation of the Growth Management

Act, cannot be considered as “adequate public services or facilities” which could be “provided in an efficient manner.”

With respect to police services, a joint letter from Shoreline Police, the King County Sheriff’s office, and the City of Shoreline, dated March 11, referred to as SEIS item #4 observes:

There are no nearby areas of unincorporated Snohomish County patrolled on a regular basis by the Snohomish County Sheriff’s Office that could provide any reasonable response time for emergencies, or even routine non-emergency service. There are at least 15 signalized intersections between Point Wells and the nearest SCSO facility, located in Mill Creek, over 13 miles away. Snohomish County emergency response times, under the best circumstances with light traffic, would conservatively be at least 15 minutes (per MSN maps). Nationally recognized best police practice for Priority X calls (critical dispatches where incidents pose an obvious danger to the life of a citizen or officer) is less than 5 minutes. Priority 1 calls (those requiring immediate police action) are designated as less than 12 minutes. By way of contrast and example, the Shoreline Police Department averages 3.31 minutes for Priority X, 6.8 minutes for Priority 1, and 10.78 minutes for Priority 2 calls. In addition 911 and dispatch services to Point Wells are provided through the King County Communications Center . . .resources from the SCSO are simply located too far away to provide the necessary emergency and routine police protection required for a mixed use urban center.

The FSEIS suggestion that police and fire services to an Urban Center at Point Wells can be “provided in an efficient manner” by a rural fire district and the Snohomish County Sheriff’s office, frankly is nonsense.

RCW 36.70A.020(3) provides:

Transportation. Encourage efficient multimodal transportation systems that are based on regional priorities and coordinated with county and city comprehensive plans. (Emphasis added).

Comment: There is no “efficient multimodal transportation system” available to Point Wells, and there are no facts in the SEIS to support a conclusion that one will ever be available. This deficiency was even acknowledged by the County’s own transit agency, Community Transit, in its comment letter:

Community Transit has concerns regarding the proposal to designate the Point Wells site as an urban center. Whereas other existing and proposed urban centers such as Ash Way and Cathcart are situated on major existing or planned transit

emphasis corridors with excellent infrastructure and regional connectivity, the Point Wells site is isolated from the remainder of Snohomish County.

RCW 36.70A.020(9) provides:

Open space and recreation. Retain open space, enhance recreational opportunities, conserve fish and wildlife habitat, increase access to natural resource lands and water, and develop parks and recreation facilities. (Emphasis added).

Comment: The SEIS acknowledges that a project on the scale of an Urban Center at Point Wells would generate demand for an on-site park facility, yet a park facility is not identified as a required component in the Paramount amendment. Furthermore, dedication and improvement of a parks facility alone is insufficient to enhance recreational opportunities. How would such a dedicated park be maintained “efficiently” by a County parks department whose closest facility (Esperance Park in Edmonds) is 5 miles away? Snohomish County Parks Department has not indicated they have the resources to do so.

RCW 36.70A.020(10) provides:

Environment. Protect the environment and enhance the state's high quality of life, including air and water quality, and the availability of water. (Emphasis added).

Comment: The noise, air, and water quality impacts of a project of 3,500 units at Point Wells would plainly degrade, not protect, the quality of life for residents of the adjacent neighborhoods of Shoreline and Woodway.

RCW 36.70A.020(11) provides:

Citizen participation and coordination. Encourage the involvement of citizens in the planning process and ensure coordination between communities and jurisdictions to reconcile conflicts. (Emphasis added).

Comment: To date, opportunities to participate in the County’s process have consisted of a chance to comment on a draft EIS and to speak during a crowded Planning Commission hearing agenda which included dozens of other items and for which the Commission could not even muster a quorum. The most affected communities of an Urban Center at Point Wells are Shoreline and Woodway – the County has not yet engaged in a meaningful process to ensure coordination and reconcile conflicts. We strongly urge the County Council to comply with this GMA goal by deferring action on the present Paramount amendment and engage the Shoreline and Woodway communities through an Interlocal Agreement and joint planning process.

RCW 36.70A.020(12) provides:

Public facilities and services. Ensure that those public facilities and services necessary to support development shall be adequate to serve the development at the

time the development is available for occupancy and use without decreasing current service levels below locally established minimum standards. (Emphasis added).

Comment: See comments above on Goals 2, 3, and 9.

Further, RCW 36.70A.100 provides:

The comprehensive plan of each county or city that is adopted pursuant to RCW 36.70A.040 shall be coordinated with, and consistent with, the comprehensive plans adopted pursuant to RCW 36.70A.040 of other counties or cities with which the county or city has, in part, common borders or related regional issues. (Emphasis added).

RCW 36.70A.110 provides in part:

(4) In general, cities are the units of local government most appropriate to provide urban governmental services. In general, it is not appropriate that urban governmental services be extended to or expanded in rural areas except in those limited circumstances shown to be necessary to protect basic public health and safety and the environment and when such services are financially supportable at rural densities and do not permit urban development. (Emphasis added).

RCW 36.70A.210 provides in part:

1) The legislature recognizes that counties are regional governments within their boundaries, and cities are primary providers of urban governmental services within urban growth areas. (Emphasis added).

Comment: The three sections cited above illuminate the fundamental reason why the Urban Center designation for Point Wells does not comply with the Planning Goals of RCW 36.70A.020 – namely, that Paramount asks the County to create an intense urban center that relies upon “urban governmental” facilities and services provided not by cities, but by the County itself and special purpose districts. This is contrary to the GMA’s clear direction that “cities are the units of government most appropriate to provide urban governmental services” (RCW 36.70A.110) and that “cities are primary providers of urban governmental services within urban growth areas” (RCW 36.70A.210).

The City of Shoreline is a city with which the County “shares a common border.” The record demonstrates that the City of Shoreline is clearly the most impacted by the proposed plan amendment and also the entity most capable of providing efficient “urban governmental services” to Point Wells. For the County’s action to fail to

recognize these factors flies in the face of the mandate at RCW 36.70A.100 for the County to achieve coordination and consistency with the City's plans.

Moving Forward

The City recognizes that the Point Wells property is presently within unincorporated Snohomish County and that both the County and Paramount have expended considerable time and resources to bring forward the issue of the future of Point Wells. The Shoreline City Council and staff have been heavily engaged with our citizens on this topic for many months. While the Shoreline City Council stands by its position opposing the Paramount amendment as submitted, we urge the County Council to consider alternatives.

In Resolution 285, we acknowledge that mixed use is appropriate for Point Wells. We believe that such a use mix could conceivably include commercial uses on the order of 85,000 square feet as described in the Paramount Amendment. However, we are adamant that an Urban Center designation which contemplates up to 3,500 units is simply too much. An "Urban Center" may be an appropriate designation for sites on Highway 99 which are served by a five lane state highway and which are scheduled to receive high capacity transit service this year in the form of the "Swift" bus rapid transit system. However, due to the demonstrated lack of any comparable high capacity transit service to Point Wells, to say nothing of its distance from the regional road grid, this remote corner of Snohomish County is not a logical site for the UC designation.

Rather than the intensive development scenario that an "Urban Center" entails, we believe that a more realistically scaled designation is appropriate. While we oppose a development scenario as intense as an "Urban Center," we do believe that the Paramount site presents an opportunity for both residential and commercial development. Yet, a development at half or even a third the magnitude of an "Urban Center" would create a demand for urban governmental services at Point Wells, including police, fire, and parks.

It would appear obvious that the City's proximity to Point Wells, and its direct road access via Richmond Beach Road/Richmond Beach Drive, would make Shoreline the logical urban service provider to Point Wells. In contrast to the "solutions" offered in the SEIS, the City is much closer and better positioned to serve the Paramount site.

As noted, the closest Snohomish County Sheriff precinct station is 13 miles away, while the City's Richmond Beach Police Storefront station is just 2 miles away; the closest Fire District 1 facility is 6.4 miles away, while the Shoreline Fire Department's closest station is only 2.6 miles from Point Wells; and the closest County Park is 5 miles away, while the City's newest park, Kayu Kayu Ac, is less than half a mile away. Underscoring the gross inefficiency of the method of urban

service delivery suggested by the SEIS is the fact that to provide these services from Snohomish County would require the fire truck, aid car, police car, or parks crew to drive right past the Shoreline facilities on the way.

We have previously alerted both the County and Woodway that the City has initiated a process to develop its own subarea plan and zoning regulations for Point Wells. We will complete our own environmental review this summer and expect to undertake public hearings this fall. Therefore, in the spirit of inter-jurisdictional cooperation, we invite the County, Paramount, and Woodway, to participate in the City's process, with the objective of identifying coordinated, realistic and responsible ways to establish future land use and service delivery plans for Point Wells. We also ask that the County Council deny, or at least delay, the approval of the Paramount Plan amendment pending the outcome of the City's process.

Alternatively, if the County Council feels compelled to approve something in the near term, we urge you to give the final designation something to distinguish it from the generic "Urban Center" in the County Code. This could perhaps be designated a "Waterfront Urban Village" which would allow a use of mixes, but recognize that without high capacity transit those uses must be more modest in scale than an Urban Center. Such a designation would also recognize that most of the Paramount site is subject to the separate regulatory authority of the Shoreline Management Act, which includes specific requirements, for example, for public access to and along the water's edge.

We also urge the County Council to create a triggering mechanism in the County code to assure that both Shoreline and Woodway will have a meaningful role in defining the development standards and process that will apply to the review and approval of any future project at Point Wells.

Last, it is important for both the County and Paramount to be aware of the magnitude of financial obligation that a project at Point Wells will create for the developer in terms of SEPA mitigations on the City's road network. Beginning with the County's SEIS, and as detailed by the information in the City's independent analysis (summarized in the attached memo from Mark Relph, the City's Public Works Director), we know that the necessary traffic mitigations for this proposal are going to be significant.

The SEIS did a reasonable job of estimating some of the costs for mitigations; however, it did not identify all of the mitigations that Shoreline believes are warranted. Specifically, among others, the SEIS did not include the cost of constructing sidewalks along Richmond Beach Drive. We believe that the SEIS estimate of \$11-12 million in traffic mitigations is far too low. A more detailed critique of the SEIS is attached. From our analysis, it is likely that the total capital costs for the necessary traffic mitigations will be on the order of \$30 million.

In addition, the developer should be required to fund a "Transportation Corridor Congestion and Safety Study" for the road network between Point Wells and SR 99 in order to create detailed engineering and project costs for the intersection and road segments identified in the City's attached report. The scope and details of such "Transportation Corridor Congestion and Safety Study," as well as the final dollar amount to pay for the necessary traffic mitigations, must be done no later than the subsequent SEPA analysis for an actual development proposal pursuant to the eventual County or City zoning in place.

Thank you for giving serious consideration to our concerns and suggestions. Our staff is available to answer questions or assist with analysis. Please contact Shoreline Planning Director Joseph Tovar at 206-801-2501 or jtovar@shorelinewa.gov.

Sincerely,



Cindy Ryu, Mayor
City of Shoreline

cc: John Koster, County Councilman for District 1
Brian Sullivan, County Councilman for District 2
Dave Gossett, County Councilman for District 4
Dave Somers, County Councilman for District 5
The Honorable Carla Nichols, Mayor of the Town of Woodway

Attachment - July 6, 2009 Memorandum from Mark Relph titled "Comments on Point Wells Traffic Analysis"




City of Shoreline

17544 Midvale Avenue North
Shoreline, WA 98133-4921
(206) 546-1700 ♦ Fax (206) 546-2200

MEMORANDUM

Date: July 6, 2009

To: Joe Tovar, Director of Planning

From: Mark J. Relph, Director of Public Works 

Subject: Comments on Point Wells Traffic Analysis

Following is a summary of the analysis undertaken by Public Works to evaluate the Draft SEIS, and the subsequent FEIS. The analysis was undertaken by staff with the assistance of HW Lochner and Associates and DKS and Associates. Lochner assisted with the Synchro Model analysis and the evaluation and cost estimation of mitigation for the full build out scenario. We also asked DKS and Associates review the modelling work to verify that our assumptions, scenario development, and Synchro analysis were solid.

FEIS Responses

Shoreline submitted several comments on the Draft SEIS. Included in these comments was a basic assumption that the background traffic growth estimates were too high. Our comment was based on the fact that Shoreline is close to being "built out" and our traffic counts indicate that we have been experiencing negative traffic growth for the past four years. Assuming a 2% growth rate does not make sense. In our traffic analysis of the build out scenario, we utilized a 0.25% annual traffic growth factor. Overestimation of background traffic growth may equate to a lowered level of impact from the proposed development, and therefore potentially a lower estimated mitigation cost and responsibility.

Traffic Analysis

Attached to this memo is a table summarizing our Level of Service analysis for the build out scenario using our background data (0.25% annual growth). It indicates that four intersections would reach LOS F (failure) by 2025 with the Point Wells build out project. In addition, two intersections would reach E. Also attached to this memo is a summary of mitigation needs to address intersections with LOS problems, intersections with safety issues, and street segments needing sidewalks to ensure pedestrian safety and to encourage transit usage.

Point Wells build out project. In addition, two intersections would reach E. Also attached to this memo is a summary of mitigation needs to address intersections with LOS problems, intersections with safety issues, and street segments needing sidewalks to ensure pedestrian safety and to encourage transit usage.

Crash rates are fairly high on this corridor, with the intersection of 3rd NW and Richmond Beach Road ranked as the intersection with the highest crash rate in Shoreline. In this location, we believe the high crash rates can be mitigated by the addition of left turn pockets on the east and west legs of the intersection..

Cost to Mitigate Build-out Scenario

The conclusion of our analysis indicates the build out scenario will require mitigation on nine intersections or street segments. The total cost of mitigation is approximately \$30 million. There are four sidewalk projects and four signal/intersection improvements to address both safety, efficiency and to encourage multi-modality. The four sidewalk projects include sidewalks on Richmond Beach Drive NW from NW 196th to NW 205th, NW 196th from Richmond Beach Drive NW to 24th NW, and from NW 196th to 20th NW. The intersection projects include NW 195th and 20th NW, NW Richmond Beach Road and 15th NW, 8th NW and 3rd NW.

Because of the many challenges in this corridor, as well as it's unique characteristics, we recommend that the developer fund a Richmond Beach Corridor study of the Richmond Beach Road/Drive corridor spanning from the 205th entrance to Point Wells to Aurora at N 185th. This study should examine and identify safety enhancements, roadway efficiencies and accomodation and promotion of alternative modes. The study should include input from the neighborhood residents, as well as transit providers, and the developer representatives. Shoreline Public Works staff should manage the study. It would result in a corridor plan that would be approved by the City Council and would identify specific projects, with scope and costs to mitigate the Point Wells proposed project. We estimate that this study would cost approximately \$200,000.

Conclusion

I have several attachments to supplement the above. They include a level of service analysis summary table and summarized project planning level cost estimates. Keep in mind, that with a corridor study, the project descriptions could change, as well as the cost estimates.

Richmond Beach Rd - Point Wells Impact Analysis Model

Intersection Analysis	2007 Base - Shoreline						2025 Base - Shoreline							
	Overall LOS	Approach LOS				Ave Intersect Delay	Intersect Capacity Utilization	Overall LOS	Approach LOS				Ave Intersect Delay	Intersect Capacity Utilization
		EB	WB	NB	SB				EB	WB	NB	SB		
Richmond Beach Dr NW/NW 196th St	A		A			6.5	18.9	A		A	A	A	7.4	21.1
NW 196th St/24th Ave NW	A	A	A	A	A	7.3	25.3	A	A	A	A	A	7.7	26.3
NW 196th St/20th Ave NW	A	A	A	A	B	9.1	39.6	B	B	B	A	A	11.9	47.2
NW Richmond Bch Rd/15th Ave NW (w)	A				B	1.5	27.3	A	A	A		C	3.6	32.2
NW Richmond Bch Rd/15th Ave NW (e)	A	A	B	A		9.8	38.1	A	A	A	C		3.6	45.5
NW Richmond Bch Rd/8th Ave NW	C	C	C	D	D	30.5	61	D	D	D	E	D	52.9	86
NW Richmond Bch Rd/3rd Ave NW	A	A	A	B	B	5.5	62.2	A	A	A	B	C	9.2	66.5
N Richmond Bch Rd/Dayton Ave N	B	B	A	C		12.2	41.6	B	B	A	C		12.5	50
N 185th St/Fremont Ave N	C	C	C	D	D	33.4	59.4	C	C	B	D	D	33.3	73.3
N 185th St/Linden Ave N	C	C	B	D	D	21.9	42.4	B	A	B	D	D	16.8	49.4
N 185th St/Midvale Ave N	A	A	A	A	A	6.1	47.7	B	B	B	C	C	18.9	61.8
Aurora Ave N/N 205th St	D	F	E	B	D	42.3	90	E	F	F	E	E	74.7	110.8
Aurora Ave N/N 200th St	C	E	E	B	B	29.2	85.9	C	F	F	C	B	33.7	95.6
Aurora Ave N/N 192nd St	A	E	E	A	A	8.7	61.7	B	F	E	A	B	14	75.4
Aurora Ave N/N 185th St	C	E	E	C	B	29.6	77.6	D	E	F	D	C	54.2	94.7
Aurora Ave N/N 175th St	C	E	D	C	C	34.2	75.3	D	E	E	D	D	50.7	98.1
Midvale Ave N/N 175th St	B	A	A	E	E	10.6	48.4	B	B	A	C	C	11.8	63.8
Fremont Ave N/N 175th St	A	B	B	A	A	7.4	55.9	A	B	B	A	A	8.1	63.4
Arterial Route Analysis	Travel Time	Distance (mi)			Ave Speed	Arterial LOS	Travel Time	Distance (mi)			Ave Speed	Arterial LOS		
EB Richmond Bch Rd btwn 15th Ave NW/Dayton Ave N	217.2	1.4			22.9	C	252.3	1.4			20.3	C		
EB N 185th St btwn Dayton Ave N/Midvale Ave N	193.5	0.6			11.3	E	193.5	0.6			11.3	E		
WB N 185th St btwn Midvale Ave N/Fremont Ave N	178.1	0.4			8.9	E	202.8	0.4			7.8	E		
WB Richmond Bch Rd btwn Fremont Ave N/20th Ave NW	170.4	1.1			22.5	C	280.2	1.7			21.7	C		
NB Aurora Ave N btwn N 205th St/N 175th St	257.1	1.7			24	C	363.1	1.7			17	D		
SB Aurora Ave N btwn N 205th St/N 175th St	240.6	1.7			24.8	C	276.9	1.7			21.6	D		

Richmond Beach Rd - Point Wells Impact Analysis Model

Intersection Analysis	2025 Point Wells - 1286 trips						
	Overall LOS	Approach LOS				Ave Intersect Delay	Intersect Capacity Utilization
		EB	WB	NB	SB		
Richmond Beach Dr NW/NW 196th St	F		F	A	F	120.7	96
NW 196th St/24th Ave NW	F	F	F	B	B	130.8	60.2
NW 196th St/20th Ave NW	B	A	B	B	B	10.6	83.2
NW Richmond Bch Rd/15th Ave NW (w)	A	A	A		C	3	49.5
NW Richmond Bch Rd/15th Ave NW (e)	A	A	A	C		3.5	79.8
NW Richmond Bch Rd/8th Ave NW	F	E	F	F	E	97.6	102.4
NW Richmond Bch Rd/3rd Ave NW	B	B	A	C	D	16.6	83.7
N Richmond Bch Rd/Dayton Ave N	B	B	B	C		14.8	65
N 185th St/Fremont Ave N	D	C	D	E	E	49.3	88.7
N 185th St/Linden Ave N	B	A	A	D	D	10.8	60.8
N 185th St/Midvale Ave N	B	B	B	C	C	19.4	65.6
Aurora Ave N/N 205th St	F	F	F	F	E	82.6	114.1
Aurora Ave N/N 200th St	D	F	F	D	B	42.3	99.6
Aurora Ave N/N 192nd St	B	F	E	A	C	16.1	78.6
Aurora Ave N/N 185th St	E	F	F	D	E	71.6	106.3
Aurora Ave N/N 175th St	E	F	F	D	C	56.1	105.9
Midvale Ave N/N 175th St	A	A	A	D	D	9.6	65.8
Fremont Ave N/N 175th St	A	B	B	A	A	8.2	65.7
Arterial Route Analysis	Travel Time	Distance (mi)			Ave Speed	Arterial LOS	
EB Richmond Bch Rd btwn 15th Ave NW/Dayton Ave N	261.5	1.4			19.6	C	
EB N 185th St btwn Dayton Ave N/Midvale Ave N	198.7	0.6			11	E	
WB N 185th St btwn Midvale Ave N/Fremont Ave N	270.9	0.4			5.8	F	
WB Richmond Bch Rd btwn Fremont Ave N/20th Ave NW	350.8	1.7			17.4	D	
NB Aurora Ave N btwn N 205th St/N 175th St	410.7	1.7			15.1	E	
SB Aurora Ave N btwn N 205th St/N 175th St	316.2	1.7			18.9	D	

**Point Wells Mitigation
Planning Level Cost Estimates**

<u>Location</u>	<u>Description of Improvement</u>	<u>Estimate</u>
Richmond Beach Dr. NW NW 196th Street to NW 205th Street	Sidewalk on the east side of roadway	\$1,557,414.00
Richmond Beach Dr. NW NW 196th Street to NW 205th Street	Sidewalk on the west side of roadway	\$16,683,236.00
NW 196th Street Richmond Beach Dr NW to 24th Ave NW	Sidewalk on both sides of roadway	\$2,053,773.00
NW 196th Street 24th Avenue NW to 20th Avenue NW	Sidewalk on the east side of roadway	\$300,000.00
NW 195th Street & 20th Avenue NW	Traffic Signal with additional EB-WB left turn lanes	\$1,330,973.00
NW Richmond Beach Rd NW & 15th Avenue NW	Traffic Signal and additional EB-WB left turn lanes	\$2,208,156.00
NW Richmond Beach Rd NW & 8th Avenue NW	Intersection Safety and Capacity Improvements	\$2,131,458.00
NW Richmond Beach Rd NW & 3rd Avenue NW	Widen & replace trafffic signal for EB-WB left turns	\$2,316,775.00
Richmond Beach Corridor Study	Safety, Efficiency, Multimodal Plan	<u>\$200,000.00</u>
	TOTAL	\$28,781,785.00