Lakepointe Urban Village Subarea

Addendum to April 11, 2017 City Council Agenda Item 1, Attachment 5, Comment Letters/Emails Received
Thank you for the email to the City Council. Your comments will be entered into the public record for the hearing on April 11.

Sharon

Sharon G Scott
Executive Assistant/City Clerk
City of Covington
16720 SE 271st Street, Suite 100
Covington, WA 98042

phone: 253-480-2405
fax: 253-480-2401
website: www.covingtonwa.gov

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication is intended for the sole use of the individual and entity to whom it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. You are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or duplication of this communication by someone other than the intended addressee or its designated agent is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please advise sender and delete the message and any attachments without reading or disclosing its contents.

From: kieferskunk@gmail.com [mailto:kieferskunk@gmail.com] On Behalf Of Matt Kellner
Sent: Wednesday, April 5, 2017 2:28 PM
To: City Council <CityCouncil@covingtonwa.gov>
Subject: Formal letter to the City Council re Lakepointe Urban Village, for 4/11/2017 public hearing.

April 5, 2017

To: Covington City Council

Re: Lakepointe Urban Village Development Agreement

This is a formal request that this letter be provided to the Covington City Council as a matter of public record prior to the Public Hearing on April 11, 2017.
Dear City Council,

I am writing to express my deep concerns about the Lakepointe Urban Village development proposal and the Development Agreement that is currently being discussed in the City Council. Specifically, I would like to address some issues that have recently come to light, that I believe present a grave risk to Covington's future.

On March 16th, the City Planning Commission held a public hearing to form a recommendation to the City Council on Oakpointe's request to change the zoning rules and boundaries in the development area. In addition to letters and testimony from the community, the Commission was issued the draft Development Agreement document, totaling more than three hundred pages, less than one week before the hearing. A 75-page addendum to this agreement was submitted only the day before that hearing, and according to one commissioner we spoke with afterward, the original Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), which is more than 400 pages long, was never issued to them at all (a link may have been sent in a memo), requiring them to search for it on the city’s website so they could use it for reference.

I'm sure we can all agree that a combined 800 pages is a lot of material to review - so much, in fact, that no single person could properly review all of it in time for the hearing (especially since the commissioners are not allowed to meet with each other on these matters outside of public hearings). As such, we do not believe the Planning Commission could make a valid, good-faith recommendation to you on the DA because they were not given sufficient time to make an informed decision. This is corroborated by one commissioner, who said they regretted the outcome of that hearing because they hadn't been properly briefed on what it was they were being asked to recommend.

My wife and I received a copy of the SEPA Addendum shortly after the 3/16 hearing (thank you, by the way), and we found much of the information there to be very confusing. Some of it appears to be self-contradictory and conflicts with prior documents. For example, starting on Page 12, it discusses discrepancies between various drafts of the EIS about the amount of green space that is considered "protected" (decreasing by arbitrary amounts), the amount that would be permanently removed by the developer (increasing by different, inconsistent amounts), and the "ground carbon emissions" expected to result from each of the development alternatives. That section of the addendum states that those discrepancies were resolved, but fails to explain how that decision was reached, citing apparently arbitrary calculations and legalistic conclusions that, to an average person, amount to little more than "Trust us on this". The Addendum has many such examples of this kind of "weasel wording" that fails to adequately explain these conclusions and "mitigations" in terms that an average person should be expected to understand. The data that is there is clearly incomplete and often misleading, showing clear bias in the developer’s favor, and does not sufficiently explore anything other than the "best case" scenarios. And if the reader wishes to verify these figures through third-parties (e.g. online carbon calculators), it is very difficult to do so because we don’t have access to all of the needed data.

Also, at the 3/16 hearing, it was apparent that the city staff (Mr. Hart in particular) were not prepared to answer questions from the Planning Commission. Mr. Hart frequently deferred to Oakpointe's representatives to answer the Commission's questions - especially when asked about what studies had been performed regarding potential impacts to local traffic, schools, crime, etc. Oakpointe's attorney answered almost all of the questions in very general ways - usually just stating that the studies had been done, but not revealing any significant details. It's really not surprising that Oakpointe has bankrolled all of these studies itself (I believe this is a matter of public record). When the developer holds all the cards, it's all too easy for these studies to come out in its favor.

What information we HAVE been able to glean shows that, in particular, the traffic studies are focused solely on the LUV itself (for example, it states that the Covington Connector will provide sufficient capacity to serve the LUV), but they pay little more than lip service to the surrounding connectors (e.g. the 204th and 272nd arterials). It's worth noting that those studies date back several years, before some of the more recent
developments (such as the Novo condo complex on 272nd) even broke ground. Traffic congestion in these areas has gotten MUCH worse VERY quickly since then, illustrating the need for updated information and revisions to the traffic plan. With every one of the streets that will connect to the Covington Connector being two-lane roads (and in the case of the 191st Pl. SE connector, a single-lane residential street), how can we expect these already congested streets to handle the additional traffic the LUV will cause?

We are also not satisfied with the level of attention the plan has given to the potential for increased crime in the LUV and surrounding neighborhoods. The DA calls for a "police storefront" in the LUV, and separate documents call for either 1.5 or 4.5 police officers (without explaining the difference). We have also seen and heard at various times that the DA calls for just one dedicated police officer, a second non-dedicated officer (likely stationed elsewhere), and reliance on a joint agreement with the City of Maple Valley to provide additional, non-dedicated law enforcement in the LUV. We do not believe the LUV can be sustained with this few officers. Additionally, we are concerned that the DA mentions how the cost of the new officers "can be offset by tax revenues" from the LUV - this is not a "must", and it assumes that the LUV will bring in sufficient tax revenue to pay the officers without delays. If those revenues do NOT meet the required levels, or they don’t come in on the expected schedule, the officers may not get paid at all, or their pay would have to come from other sources that the City has already said it does not have.

So, to sum up so far: The DA is being rushed, as evidenced by the Planning Commission's inability to fully review the documents before rubber-stamping their recommendation to you. The DA has significant gaps in coverage, unclear language, and data that is very clearly biased toward the developer and AGAINST the city. It is full of weasel language that gives the developer too many concessions and ways out while leaving the City vulnerable should things not go as planned. And our infrastructure needs in areas outside of the LUV itself are not being addressed.

Now, all of this alone should already be of grave concern to you, but to emphasize just how critically important it is that you take it seriously, let’s take a look at what’s happening in Black Diamond as we speak.

Oakpointe entered into a similar Development Agreement with the City of Black Diamond several years ago. The development was rushed through the city council, it was extremely unpopular with the city’s residents, and it contained many similar flaws and weasel language - including a clause that basically allowed the developer to skip out on thousands of dollars in fees that would be part of any standard development contract. Once passed, a strong majority of the city's residents voted three of the five council members out, and the new councillors attempted to stop development because of the damage it was already doing to the city, citing details that were withheld from the original council, were not well understood, or were patently unfair to the city.

In response, Oakpointe is now suing the city for breach of contract AND is targeting those individual council members, targeting them with every small infraction that occurred during the process - things as simple as failing to minute a chance lunch break between two of the councillors. Black Diamond is now a public laughingstock, and the subject of many news stories on local public radio and television. It has even made several of this area's newspapers, with articles covering the lawsuit, speculating as to how it could go so wrong, and talking about how this has all but destroyed Black Diamond as a city. Property values there have plummeted, making it very difficult for residents to move away. The city’s economy is in a shambles, and the city government has almost completely stopped being able to serve the needs of its residents, all because of this lawsuit.

I have heard from several people familiar with the Black Diamond situation who have all independently said that Oakpointe (alternately Yarrow Bay Holdings) engaged in similar tactics there. These include submitting their paperwork at the last possible moment, filling the development agreement with weasel language, selling the city council on “the dream” through their elaborate mockups, and speaking for the city staff at hearings.
instead of letting them answer questions properly. These are the same tactics that Oakpointe is now using here in Covington - on you, our elected representatives - and we do not like it.

Again, many questions have been left unanswered. Much of this development agreement was written without any input whatsoever from the communities most affected by it. By our estimates, more than 80% of the city still doesn’t even know that this project is happening at all. Concerns we have been able to bring to you have so far fallen on deaf ears - Oakpointe has made some concessions, sure, but on closer examination, they do little to address our true concerns. We all are being asked to accept a broad, long-term contract, filled with exceptions to our existing laws and policies solely for Oakpointe’s benefit, without being allowed to see the complete, long-term picture. This has all given your voters the impression that you’re only looking at the short-term benefits of an urban center, without considering the long-term consequences and impacts to the City’s reputation and economic viability.

Let me be clear: The Lakepointe Urban Village, as it is laid out in the Development Agreement right now, is extremely risky to the City. It will subject Covington to the threat of the same kind of lawsuit that is happening to Black Diamond right now - Oakpointe’s powerful and very thorough attorneys against a city that has already admitted it is strapped for cash. A lawsuit that the people who voted for you will have to pay for. And it means that, should things not follow the absolute best case scenario, Covington will be on the hook to sustain a development that it can’t afford. You and I and everyone else who still lives in Covington at that point will be left holding the bag - none of the affluent residents that you hope to attract with this development will want to come to this city if it has a reputation of being overbuilt, congested, crime-ridden and run down.

We want to make sure that this Development Agreement has been fully and independently reviewed, that every discrepancy has been properly resolved with firm backing data, and that our concerns are fully addressed in clear, unequivocal terms. We want to see updated, complete and INDEPENDENT studies on traffic impacts, crime, and the local ecosystem. We want these studies to be paid for and conducted by an independent firm not connected to either Oakpointe or the people who oppose it, so that we can be assured that the information being presented to you is accurate, fair and unbiased. We want proof that such an urban development really IS in the best interest of the City of Covington and ALL of its residents BEFORE it proceeds, not after.

I humbly but urgently request that you delay your decision on the Development Agreement, and in particular the zoning changes that Oakpointe has recently requested, until this full review has been completed. We all want what is best for our city, but we want to be sure that you are making the RIGHT decision for our city and for your people.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Matt Kellner, Covington resident since 2006.

--
-- Matt Kellner
mattckellner@gmail.com
Sharon Scott

From: Sharon Scott
Sent: Wednesday, April 5, 2017 4:11 PM
To: 'Cynthia Calhoun'; City Council
Cc: Ann Mueller; Richard Hart
Subject: RE: Letter to Covington City Council re: Lakepointe Urban Village Development Agreement

Thank you for the email to the City Council. Your comments will be entered into the public record for the hearing on April 11.

Sharon

Sharon G Scott
Executive Assistant/City Clerk
City of Covington
16720 SE 271st Street, Suite 100
Covington, WA 98042

phone: 253-480-2405
fax: 253-480-2401
website: www.covingtonwa.gov

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication is intended for the sole use of the individual and entity to whom it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. You are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or duplication of this communication by someone other than the intended addressee or its designated agent is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please advise sender and delete the message and any attachments without reading or disclosing its contents.

From: Cynthia Calhoun [mailto:cynthia_calhoun@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 5, 2017 2:15 PM
To: City Council <CityCouncil@covingtonwa.gov>
Subject: Letter to Covington City Council re: Lakepointe Urban Village Development Agreement

April 5, 2017

To: Covington City Council

Re: Lakepointe Urban Village Development Agreement

This is a formal request that this letter be provided to the Covington City Council as a matter of public record prior to the Public Hearing on April 11, 2017.
Dear Covington City Council,

I am a voter in Covington and a senior citizen on Social Security. My husband is on disability. We have a limited, fixed income, with little left over after our basic bills are paid.

I ask that you consider the Lakepointe DA very carefully and make sure you keep in mind all of the citizens of Covington. Traffic in Covington is already a problem. The added traffic from the project is going to affect the entire Covington area in a negative way.

I have been very involved with the Kent School District and I know their resources are stretched thin all of the time. Another 900+ students would severely impact their ability to offer a quality education to the students.

We already have a crime problem in my area with continuous mail theft and car prowls. Even the best complex of retail and 1,500 new living units is likely to increase that, just with the influx of people, including transients. If things don’t happen as planned and we end up with not quite the upscale location that we expect, this could be a major problem. There has already been a gang and drug problem in the Timberlane area and this could become worse. I do not want to have to be afraid to go outside! I do not want to have to live in fear.

Also, with our fixed income, we can’t afford our property values to go down or our taxes to go up. If our property values go down and we feel unsafe, we won’t be able to sell and move. If the project raises our property values and our taxes go appreciably up, we won’t be able to afford to stay. Especially if Covington ends up in a situation similar to that of Black Diamond and the city (which means the voters) has to pay for a lawsuit.

We moved to Covington as a nice small city, away from the metropolitan area and with a lot of greenery. I ask that you take all the time you need, without feeling pressured, to examine this entire project carefully. Especially in light of what happened in Black Diamond, you need to make sure that every part of it is good for, or at least not harmful to the RESIDENTS of Covington. Not just the tax base, the PEOPLE. The developer has a team of lawyers at their disposal; make sure YOUR lawyers do a thorough due diligence, for your sake and ours.

Honestly, looking at what happened in Black Diamond, I would stay as far away from this company as I could! If the company is toxic, anything it builds is likely to turn out to be toxic! At the previous meeting I noticed how they made it a point to act like they’re very concerned and making major concessions, trying to be a good
neighbor. I wonder how good a neighbor they'll be once you sign on the dotted line and they don't need to be nice anymore.

Please put off your acceptance of the agreement until you are absolutely sure you've plugged every loophole and understood every detail of the agreement and it is in the best interests of our city, not just of the developer.

Cynthia "Sam" Calhoun
19425 SE 266th Street, Covington, WA 98042
253-653-8898
Attached is a letter for review by the City Council with specific reference to the Development Agreement and the upcoming Public Hearing.
Thank you for the opportunity to present feedback.

Sheryl Ward
Covington Resident
25826 188th ave SE
April 4, 2017

Covington City Council

Re: Lakepointe Development Agreement

This is a formal request that this letter be provided to the Covington City Council prior to the Public Hearing on April 11, 2017.

As a concerned citizen of Covington I have taken the time to review the Lakepointe Development Agreement and have concerns regarding the following portions of the document.

Recitals (excerpts)

N: IV Waiver of the City’s three-year limitation rule for rezoning of the property (benefits the MD)
N: V Site wide application of the City’s tree preservation requirements (benefits the MD)

P: I Utilizing the existing neighborhood for emergency response utilizing 191 Place SE [Development of 191 Place SE negatively impact the existing neighborhood. The existing neighborhood was not designed to sustain the impact of arterial traffic to/from LUV. 191 Place SE will increase traffic throughout the existing neighborhood and vehicles will not remain on 191 place SE nor will it be solely used for emergency response.]

P: III Reduce congestion on State Route 516 utilizing the Covington Connector by diverting 440 peak hour trips to the new road way Traffic will not be contained to the Covington Connector. Residents of Covington and LUV will utilize SR 516, 191 Place SE and Wax Road. Exhibit 1.7.1 Section 3.8 (Summary of Impacts by Alternative) reflects significant impact to traffic patterns including an increase of 36,500 total daily trips. The increase in traffic will not be full absorbed the construction of the Covington Connector

P: VI and VII: 1/2 acres reserved for public gathering place within the commercial area and adjacent to the central pond feature

P: IX: wide range of housing options for rent and sale to accommodate a wide spectrum of future residents We have already seen a negative impact to the Covington with high density housing i.e. Polaris property. Why develop a "wide range" of housing properties that does not represent the clientele that LUV will supposedly attract
14.2 Approval of zoning map amendment and boundary line adjustment 204 acres are being re-zoned from its current mineral status to commercial and residential zone. The zoning is not granular in nature, does not define and protect current green belts nor protect existing neighborhoods.

17.3 Master Developer Design Review Committee: consisting of three members appointed by the MD. Not sure why the design review committee does not include an ad hoc member from the city council. Rather than requesting approval of the DRC by the city council a city council ad hoc member could be part of the process. This is a large project that deserves collaboration from a city council/staffer etc.

18.1.3 The landscaped Area must be landscaped. There is no definition of landscaped, does not protect existing well established green, forest, trees etc.

18.1.16 Notwithstanding the foregoing, the replacement of dead, diseased or dying landscaping, including trees, with like kind materials shall not require review or approval by the Designated Official. Kind materials does require review and approval of a Designated Official i.e. a sapling is not equivalent to a 30 year old tree even though its considered the same “kind” of material.

18.4 Tree Preservation. There is not enough definitive language supporting the maintenance of existing green belts/buffers and only preserves less than a 1/4 of existing canopy areas.

18.4.1 Preserve 20% for residential zone and 15% for commercial zoned or replant those at a 2:1 ratio. Again, 30 year only trees being replaced by a sapling does not fit the spirit of replanting a 2:1 ratio. Nor does the replanting of young tree help with the environmental impacts as identified in Exhibit 1.7.1 3.1, 3.5

18.5 Limitation on 3 year request for rezoning. The MD may request rezones more frequently than every three years. Allows for the MD to request rezoning but does not allow for the City of Covington to request rezoning.

19.2 Green Space Buffer. No formal protection of the current green space buffer.

19.2.1 RCMU no less than 70 feet wide. Does not protect the current buffer of 100 feet.

19.2.2 Zoned residential or adjacent to residential be no less than 50 feet wide. Again does not protect the current buffer.

19.2.6.2 Any healthy trees removed during the construction of trails with the Green Space Buffer adjacent development replaced at 2:1 ratio any healthy blown down trees shall be replaced on a 1:1 ratio. Allows for the removal of healthy trees. Reduces the stability of the current Green Space Buffer. Allows for replanting of not an equal tree i.e. well established 30 year old trees.

19.2.8 and 19.2.9 Overhead lighting shall be minimized within the Green Space Buffer and pedestrian scale lighting may be permitted. Allows for 24/7 lighting within the Green Space Buffer adjacent to existing homes.

19.3.3. The Master Developer shall consult with the City’s Art Commission and consider their input on the final design. MD considers the input but does not require approval of the city council.

25 Environmental Review. A 15 year DA does not allow for the City Council to fully vet if the mitigation measures will be effective.
Development Agreement back to the Planning Commission for further vetting and language that is supportive of the City of Covington, future council members and current/future residents.

Respectfully,

Sheryl Ward

Covington Resident

25826 188th ave SE
Thank you for the email to the City Council. Your comments will be entered into the public record for the hearing on April 11.

Sharon

Sharon G Scott
Executive Assistant/City Clerk
City of Covington
16720 SE 271st Street, Suite 100
Covington, WA 98042

Phone: 253-480-2405
Fax: 253-480-2401
Website: www.covingtonwa.gov

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication is intended for the sole use of the individual and entity to whom it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. You are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or duplication of this communication by someone other than the intended addressee or its designated agent is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please advise sender and delete the message and any attachments without reading or disclosing its contents.

From: Cathy [mailto:renukala@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2017 5:47 PM
To: City Council <CityCouncil@covingtonwa.gov>
Cc: Sharon Scott <Sscott@covingtonwa.gov>
Subject: Lakepointe Urban Development

Dear Ms. Scott and City of Covington Council Staff:

My name is Cathy Cunningham. I've lived at 18728 SE 258th Pl., in Covington since 2000. In the years my husband and I have lived here, we've invested a lot of money, time and energy improving our home, yard and garden. We have also built many good, long-standing personal and business relationships within the neighborhood and in the community.

I am extremely opposed to your approving the planned Lakepointe Urban Village Developer's Agreement as it currently stands. Many of my neighbors and I have been reading the voluminous paperwork associated with this project, including trying to keep up with the many addendums to the Agreement that have been filed. However, even after asking for clarification at City Council meetings, there are still many significant questions and concerns.

I strongly recommend that you delay passing this Developer's Agreement until a thorough review of the total Developers Agreement document, including all of the recently filed Addendums, can be performed by someone with legal training. There are too many unknowns!
Much of the wording in the Developers Agreement seems vague. There are several places in the D.A. where it states that the Developer "may" or "can" decide to change some part of the Agreement slightly. For example, the developer told us if an area was zoned Commercial, they could put anything in there, there will be no limitations or control on what the Developer decides to do within that area.

There is also a statement that the Developer can decide to change the percentage of residences vs. retail outlets they put in. There are several other open-ended statements giving the Developer leeway and "wiggle-room", but I haven't seen any "if _____, then _____" statements that clearly outline what will happen if they decide to change their course of action.

I also feel the City needs to have concrete statements regarding what financial obligations it will be taking on, in case the Developer's studies and projections aren't accurate. We don't want to wind up in the same situation as Black Diamond, if we later discover something negative in all of the paperwork, and want to back out of the deal. The potential costs the City could incur are significant. It makes sense to give ourselves time for a final, thorough review by a qualified legal counsel — especially regarding any potential fees.

I also don't think we should commit to a 15 to 20 year agreement. That's a long time to deal with consequences, especially if we miss something that has a negative impact on the City. We won't be able to review or modify it for 15 - 20 yrs.

One issue I think it's important for the City to look at is the fact that box stores may not be as profitable in the future. More and more people are using the convenience of shopping online, and many box stores have failed. Macy's in Federal Way is an example.

My sister lives in University Place, and about 10 years ago they planned to put a development with a hotel and large name stores on Bridgeport Way. They went through 4 different developers, and now only have a subway shop, a library, a fire station and a Whole Foods grocery store in that area. Needless to say, that is not generating the tax dollars that the City wanted.

What happens if large-name stores, etc. decide this location in Covington isn't attractive enough to build here, or what if the Developer decides to adjust the percentages to have 75% residences and only 25% retail outlets (which a clause in the D.A. allows)? Will there be enough generated income from property taxes to cover the costs of the additional police staff, emergency responders, etc. that large of an additional population would incur?

There is no "if _____, then _____" proviso in the D.A. to protect the City from having to pick up the tab if the Developer's projections and ideas aren't as successful as their studies indicate.

I'm concerned about the potential costs to the City, to put out all of the fires that may spring up due to some issue that wasn't fully thought through. I think the City should specifically outline how to deal with the possible consequences that may arise if the developer uses one of the options that are included in the D.A.

Also, the required EIS stated: "The lead agency has determined this proposal is likely to have a significant adverse impact on the environment." We are told there will be mitigations to address this. That is incredibly vague! They agreed to a wider band of trees, but would their proposed modifications cause an improvement to that EIS conclusion?

When I purchased my home, the realtor told me that the gravel pit behind our house, which is surrounded by lots of beautiful tall trees, was designated as an area that would never be developed. We very much enjoy living in a woody area, seeing eagles fly overhead, bunnies in our yard, etc. Clearly, the Lakepointe Development will alter the ecosystem and change that.

At the March 16, 2017 City Council meeting, residents expressed concerns regarding:

1. The increased amount of traffic in our neighborhood — on other than the roads the Developer will be establishing. The Lakepointe residents will be driving on our 2-lane streets, so they can connect to 272nd. We have heard that there will be an estimated additional 2,500 trips / day. This decreases the quality of life in our neighborhoods and puts our children's safety at risk!

2. The additional school children that our already over-crowded school system will have to accommodate, which is estimated to be almost 1000 new students. We have children in classes in portables now, and teachers in the city are very concerned.

3. The increased crime that will accompany the addition of 1,500 residences & 2 hotels. — Heroin & opiate use is currently termed an "epidemic" in this area by law enforcement agencies. A budget hotel with easy on-and-off freeway access is a prime location for drug deals. — The Genesis project & the Coalition Against Sex Trafficking are very active in Federal Way and also in Kent. Two prime target areas for sex predators to pick up new victims are sporting events and shopping centers. Lakepointe will have stores located right next to a budget hotel and a freeway.

The developer's response to all of our concerns was that they have done studies that determined the impact would be negligible, or that there is no way to predict the amount of increased crime that will occur in the Lakepointe Development area, etc.

The decisions the City is making regarding this development won't just effect the few homes that are adjacent to the planned Lakepointe Development, it will effect a significant percentage of the population of Covington — including anyone in the area who has young people in their friends and family network. (The average age of a victim of sex trafficking is 13 yrs old, per the Coalition Against Sex Trafficking.)

It makes sense to have INDEPENDENT STUDIES performed to address these concerns, other than the ones the Developer paid for. It would also be nice if the Developer made the information in their reports available for public review. At this point, apparently we're just supposed to take their word for it that everything will work out fine.

PROPOSED SOLUTIONS TO THE ABOVE CONCERNS:
1. I think the City should come up with a comprehensive plan regarding how to accommodate the anticipated additional 2,578 traffic trips during peak p.m. hours. Residents will leave cities where the quality of life is decreased by crowded streets and additional noise, etc. Traffic is a
major factor in choosing where you want to live. I don’t want to have to leave my home for a better location, and I don’t want to see my property value negatively affected by adverse public reaction to the City of Covington.

2. I WOULD LIKE TO SEE A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN REGARDING HOW OUR SCHOOL SYSTEM WILL ACCOMMODATE THE ANTICIPATED ADDITIONAL 900 SCHOOL CHILDREN who will be residents of the Lakepointe Development. Again, this is a major factor in people deciding if Covington is a good place to live, spend their tax dollars, support local businesses, etc.

3. We need to be sure that this development will produce enough income to the City to cover the increased need for policing, etc. The residents of Covington need to feel safe.

The developer is trying to re-zone a large area for commercial and use, and if things go as planned, there will be what the developer called a “4-story budget hotel” close enough to several of our homes to be seen through our windows — along with the accompanying noise, criminal activity and traffic. The increased noise in our neighborhood, associated with the hotel, will be significant: dumpsters being emptied, accidental car alarms, visitors coming and going at all hours of the day and night.

I WOULD LIKE THE CITY TO GRANULATE THE PROPOSED RE-ZONING PLAN, TO GRADUATE ZONES BETWEEN THE EXISTING R-8 SECTION AND THE COMMERCIAL SECTION.

We are being told to believe the Developer’s studies, but I haven’t seen where any of those studies were made public knowledge. We need time to make sure we have a clear picture of all the possibilities that might occur, depending on which decisions the Developer makes in those cases where the Agreement states the Developer can or might do something a little different than what is proposed.

Thank you for your service to the City of Covington.

Sincerely,
Cathy Cunningham
253-630-7165
Hi,

Per Mayor Wagner's instructions at the last city council meeting, I wish to respectfully submit my attached testimony to be provided to the Covington City Council as a matter of public record pertaining to the Lakepointe Public Hearing on April 11th, 2017.

This attachment is in PDF format. Please let me know if you would prefer a different format for this document or if there is a different email address that I should send to.

Thank you very much.

Best regards,
Michael Porter
April 6th, 2017

To: Members of the Covington City Council

From: Michael Porter, Covington Resident, 25832 188th Ave Se

Re: Lakepointe Urban Village Development Agreement

Hi,

Thank you for taking the time to read my testimony. Per Mayor Wagner’s instructions, this is a written submittal for the Lakepointe Public Hearing in support of the speech I gave at the March 28th City Council meeting.

My property is on the western border of the former Hawk Property. Unfortunately, I can’t be here for the public hearing, but would like to speak to you about the Lakepointe development. I’m personally excited about this project and look forward to a sunny summer evening when my wife and I can walk to Lakepointe rather than drive to Kent Station or the Landing.

This is a rare opportunity for our city where we can be a leader by setting an example for other cities to follow when it comes to environmentally responsible development. We can show it is possible to build an urban village that is not only a boon to the community, but can be done without harming our natural environment unnecessarily.

Of course, you know where I’m going with this; the greenbelt buffer between the development and the neighborhoods of Timberlane and Covington Park. Since the maps just show a green symbol, here are some photos of where I live so you can see the greenbelt buffer in question.

As of right now, 1/3 of it is planned to be destroyed, to be paved over for a parking lot. Further south, ½ of it is planned to be destroyed to build a few townhouses.
Please keep in mind, this is not just about cutting down some tall trees. **It’s also about the irreparable harm being done to the ecosystem** that includes native plants, birds such as hawks and hummingbirds, bees, raccoons, and deer, just to name a few.

Unfortunately, these residents don’t get the opportunity to speak before you as the human citizens do. They need to rely on conscientious people like us to look out for them. Most of them will be at least displaced, many into human habitations, or at **worst killed**. Replanting trees or building parks will not help them.

Science has shown over the last few decades how important our natural environment is not just to the health of the planet, but also to our own health and quality of life. This is important to our neighbors and me. I see it’s also important to Covington and its future as it’s an entire section of the Comprehensive Plan. The following are excerpts from the plan, with statements highlighted that indicate the importance of keeping our Greenbelt Buffers intact.
GOALS AND POLICIES

NATURAL ENVIRONMENT GOALS

Goal NE-I. Foster recognition of the significant role played by natural features and systems in determining the overall environmental quality and livability of Covington.

Goal NE-II. Recognize the value of vegetation in increasing the livability of Covington, and minimize the loss of vegetation as development occurs.

Goal NE-III. Protect and enhance water resources for multiple benefits, including recreation, fish and wildlife resources and habitat, flood protection, water supply, and open space.

Goal NE-IV. In accordance with the GMA, designate and protect critical areas including wetlands, critical aquifer recharge areas, fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas, frequently flooded areas, and geologically hazardous areas, to protect the functions and values of these areas as well as to protect against threats to health, safety, and property.

Wetlands and Floodplains
Source: King County GIS Center, 2015
NATURAL ENVIRONMENT POLICIES

Environmental Quality and Standards

Policy NE-1. Protect the ecological integrity of the natural environment while allowing for compatible growth and development.

Policy NE-2. Promote conservation of natural resources and the environment in cooperation with schools, business owners, residents, affected jurisdictions, and tribes.

Policy NE-3. Encourage and support residents, workers, developers, and business owners to take active measures to protect and enhance the city's natural environment. Such measures could include use of environmentally safe vegetation control, non-toxic lawn care, composting and recycling, wetland and stream bank restoration, and use of low-impact development (LID) techniques.

Policy NE-4. Implement the mitigation actions and maintenance details contained in the most recent version of the adopted Hazard Mitigation Plan.

Policy NE-5. Maximize retention of a healthy tree cover and native vegetation and encourage restoration, replacement, and enhancement of unhealthy or disturbed trees and vegetation.
Urban Forest and Vegetation

Policy NE-6. Require protection of significant trees and limit unnecessary disturbance of vegetation, when possible, during all phases of development, and require mitigation as needed, including the appropriate ratio of replacement for trees removed during development.

Policy NE-7. Require the use of native plants in landscaping, development proposals, and erosion-control projects, and in the restoration of stream banks, lakes, shorelines, and wetlands.

Policy NE-8. Promote and support a systematic approach to enhancing the city through carefully-planned plantings and ongoing maintenance of street trees, public landscaping, and public open spaces.

Policy NE-9. Preserve existing natural trees and vegetation on steep hillsides, along stream banks and other habitat areas, and where visual buffers between uses or activities are desirable.

Air Quality, Energy, and Climate Change

Policy NE-10. Promote regional air quality standards in coordination with the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency and the Puget Sound Regional Council.

Policy NE-11. Encourage the reduction of greenhouse gases through energy conservation and reduction in vehicle emissions.
civic activities, including seating for food and beverage establishments.

Policy LU-36. Encourage a variety of commercial, residential, and recreational development types in the Lakepointe Urban Village.

Policy LU-37. Encourage a variety of housing types at various densities in the Lakepointe Urban Village to provide housing choices not currently available in one location within Covington.

Policy LU-38. Ensure that the public realm in the Lakepointe Urban Village provides places for a variety of ages, interests, and experiences and is easily accessible.

Policy LU-39. Implement design standards that facilitate development in the Lakepointe Urban Village Subarea as the northern entrance to Covington.

Policy LU-40. Ensure that the pond in the Lakepointe Urban Village serves as a major public amenity with extensive public access and a surrounding area with a mix of residential and commercial uses that offer a place for the community to gather, stroll, dine, shop, and live.

Policy LU-41. Encourage the preservation of a green space buffer, which may include public trails, along the southern border of the Lakepointe Urban Village adjacent to existing residential development.
So I ask you to amend the Development Agreement to require a minimum 100’ greenbelt buffer across the entire border of the Lakepointe Property. It’s not necessary to erode this natural space. There is still nearly 200 acres of mine that will net the developer huge profits and provide a large revenue source for the city. Do we really need to pave over our natural spaces just to wring every penny we possibly can out of this project? At what point do we cross the line to plain old Greed?

As for me, I think it’s time for us to walk our talk and back up the wisdom printed in the city’s Comprehensive Plan. If we continue to erode our natural spaces for the sake of “progress” we will look around the city one day and wonder where it all went. We’ll only have the two beautiful furs found on the city seal.

Once it’s gone... it’s gone. You can’t just put it back. It may not happen today or tomorrow. But it will happen unless we take steps now! I ask you, please don’t do it for me, or my neighbors, or yourselves.

Do it for your children and your grandchildren and their children. Because the decisions we make today will determine the world they inherit decades from now. Let’s protect the natural environment for them. Please amend the Development Agreement to enforce a minimum 100’ buffer.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

With warmest regards,

Michael Porter
Thank you for the email to the City Council. Your comments will be entered into the public record for the hearing on April 11.

Sharon
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From: Lynn Bubenas [mailto:lynnb@exoticmetals.com]  
Sent: Thursday, April 6, 2017 10:08 AM  
To: City Council <CityCouncil@covingtonwa.gov>; bethpeck@live.com; wardwj@gmail.com; Cunningham, Cathy (renukala@comcast.net) <renukala@comcast.net>  
Cc: 'sscott@ci.covingtonwa.gov' <sscott@ci.covingtonwa.gov>  
Subject: Lakepointe Urban Village

When I look at the map of the proposed development, only one word comes to mind.
You weren’t satisfied to develop the area on the east side of what you call the proposed Truck and Bus Route. Instead you plopped a bomb of an idea (which turns out to be a 4 story Budget Motel – come on!) in what is now green space.

Let me address the idea of a four story Budget Motel, pardon me, a DESTINATION Budget Motel. Really – a destination motel? What are you thinking?
This is not a budget motel community or a destination community and I’m offended that you considered it to be one. We are a family community. Four stories? (I think the term for anything over so many stories is required to be called a Hotel, I’ll have someone on our Planning Commission look into that)

What kind of clientele will be attracted to a “destination Budget Motel” or anything else just feet (not yards but feet) away from our back yards? A motel that has so much congested traffic at every exit from Highway 18, it’s difficult to get to.
Who, what, when and where did this all go sideways without any limit to the sky, with only the least required amount of non-committed notice (sneaky!)?

Who at Oakpoint lives in Covington who would have any idea of what kind of community we are?

What is a Gateway Element? Developer speak to try and confuse us, or make us feel all warm and fuzzy? Or is it like Destination Budget Motel? I don’t feel warm, fuzzy, informed or excited about your idea that will impact my environment. I have to laugh because you really thought you were going to (Gate-e-Way) with it.

And, last, why didn’t you work up a proposal for the “destination Budget Motel” in the northeast quadrant of the design? (Because you thought you could “tuck in the corner” a more bang for the $ feature?) The northeast area is much closer to Highway 18 customers for their quick-ie overnight stay, and then up and on their way the next day.

To the Planning Commission:
Please be prepared to discuss the differences between a Hotel and Motel? Thank you.
In what year did Oakpoint present their first notice?
Please be prepared to discuss how many changes were proposed?
Please have available the population of Covington at the time of the first proposal?
What is the population of Covington at this time?
Was Covington still part of the unincorporated area in King County?
What other governments were involved with this proposed development?
List the names of the Covington commissioners who approved these plans.
Do any of them still live here, or near the proposed site?
Did any of them have any experience in this kind of development?
Who stands to gain the most from this proposed development? And please don’t tell me “the good citizens of Covington” because I have
not heard anything about the city paying me for the inconvenience, noise, traffic, students, crime or the fact that I may need to wait longer for emergency response. So just who is to benefit from this proposal?

In closing, I am not all-together opposed to the proposed development, but I am opposed to any further discussion about it until an Ad Hoc Committee can be established to work with Oakpoint at every step of the way. This blank screen "that the good citizens of Covington" has $given$ away needs to have some more control switches and fast!

I need to be confident that the Community of Covington is well represented at any further discussion of this development.

I have asked enough questions to suggest a temporary pause to this decision going forward, a pause long enough to select an ad hoc committee, and long enough to be brought up to speed on this development, of course within a reasonable amount of time. It's never too late, to have a voice.

Lynn Bubenas  
Covington Resident  
18729 SE 258th Place  
Covington, WA 98042  
Wk: 253-458-7506  
Hm: 253-631-5998

Cc: The Neighborhood
Beth, I can't send this from work. Would you please get this out to the neighbors. I don't know if I'll make it to the April 11th meeting but wanted my voice heard. Thank you.
Thank you for the email to the City Council. Your comments will be entered into the public record for the hearing on April 11.
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From: Elaine K [mailto:raische@hotmail.com]  
Sent: Friday, April 7, 2017 10:07 AM  
To: City Council <CityCouncil@covingtonwa.gov>  
Subject: Comments on the Lakepointe Urban Village v

Dear councilmembers,

I would like to share my concerns with you regarding the proposed Lakepointe Urban Village development agreement, boundary line adjustment, and zoning change.

Learn from our neighbors

This large and complicated development poses a number of risks to our city, including many of the same risks that have now come to haunt our neighboring city of Black Diamond. As we watch the stress, dysfunction, and rising cost to taxpayers caused by these lawsuits in our neighboring city, my neighbors and I are growing more and more concerned about what this development means to our own hometown. This is not an abstract
concern – this is the **very same developer doing the very same thing**, and we are in clear danger of falling into the same trap that our neighbors have.

If you are not **completely sure** that the development agreement and zoning changes currently on the table protect us from the same kind of lawsuits and dysfunction, I urge you to take additional time to review and alter these documents.

**Growth targets are too aggressive**

The density proposed in this zoning change is far too aggressive. As the Greater Maple Valley Unincorporated Area Council pointed out, the "Net New Housing Units targeted for the City of Covington during the period from 2006 through the year 2031 is equal to a total of only 1,470 residential units" - so this extremely overbuilt development with 1500 units massively **exceeds the entirety of the city's housing needs**, to say nothing of the retail space. I feel that it is extremely inappropriate to install such an oversized development right next to a sensitive wetland and right over a critical aquifer recharge area.

As stated by the city in Resolution no. 2016-09, "...the City Council recognizes the importance of aligning the City's growth with the Regional Growth Strategy adopted by VISION 2040." VISION 2040 classifies Covington as a "small city". I understand that the city is currently trying to change that classification, but I would like to urge you to maintain that small city stature. We do not have the transportation infrastructure to operate as a "large city", and attempting to force our lovely city into that mold would drastically and unpleasantly alter the environment of our hometown.

What’s more, Resolution 2016-09 states that the city is to respond to the county regarding these too-heavy growth targets "by Dec 31, 2017." The city is not yet done figuring out how it wants to grow – so **passing a huge re-zoning plan such as this is premature**. The city must complete its comprehensive plan prior to accepting this re-zoning. Please take some additional time to review these ever-growing and ever-changing documents, and make sure that the zoning proposed here aligns with the city's overall future growth plans.

**Not in line with current residents' desires**

Of course we, as a city, have a right to determine in what way our city will grow, and we do not need to conform to every guideline suggested by the county. But please consider **whether you believe that it is the wish of your electorate to grow this much**. I do NOT wish our city to grow in the manner outlined in this proposed re-zoning. As author Joel Kotkin points out in The Human City, "[T]he notion that development be "steered" into ever-denser pockets violates...the wishes of the vast majority. These attitudes reflect a remarkable degree of disrespect and even contempt toward the choices people make. If people move to the periphery, it is not because they are deluded or persuaded by advertising but because they perceive that is where their quality of life is higher." (bold emphasis mine)

According to the regional growth strategy, “Concentrating growth in centers allows cities and other urban service providers to maximize the use of existing infrastructure, make more efficient and less costly investments in new infrastructure, and minimize the environmental impact of urban growth.” That describes Covington perfectly. Our city has been built as a bedroom community, a quiet place where those who work in the city can come back to in the evening. That is the key to its success.
Bedroom communities like Covington have an important role to play – and that role is entirely in opposition to such aggressive growth. Again, The Human City summarizes it perfectly: "[Residents] usually move to these communities in order not to live in a crowded place, and if forced to by a growing population, they tend to 'leapfrog' to less dense areas. They often look to their governments to act as a 'shield' that protects them from the encroaching urban world that they left for a reason." (again, bold emphasis mine)

Dear councilors, that is what we are looking to you for today. Please be our shield.
From: Sharon Scott
Sent: Monday, April 10, 2017 10:33 AM
To: 'elizabeth porter'; City Council
Cc: Ann Mueller; Richard Hart
Subject: RE: Elizabeth Porter Public Testimony for Lakepointe Urban Development Hearing April 11, 2017

Hi Elizabeth,

Thank you for the email to the City Council. Your comments will be entered into the public record for the hearing on April 11.

Sharon

Sharon G Scott  
Executive Assistant/City Clerk  
City of Covington  
16720 SE 271st Street, Suite 100  
Covington, WA 98042

phone: 253-480-2405  
fax: 253-480-2401  
website: www.covingtonwa.gov

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication is intended for the sole use of the individual and entity to whom it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. You are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or duplication of this communication by someone other than the intended addressee or its designated agent is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please advise sender and delete the message and any attachments without reading or disclosing its contents.

From: elizabeth porter [mailto:bethpeck@live.com]
Sent: Friday, April 7, 2017 3:15 PM
To: City Council <CityCouncil@covingtonwa.gov>; Sharon Scott <Sscott@covingtonwa.gov>
Subject: Elizabeth Porter Public Testimony for Lakepointe Urban Development Hearing April 11, 2017

Dear Council Members,

My name is Elizabeth Porter, a Covington resident who lives at 25832 188th Ave SE, in the Covington Park neighborhood. I am unable to attend the public hearing on April 11th, so I am submitting written testimony via this e-mail.

My initial concerns for land use associated with Lakepointe Urban Village had a lot to do with the fact that our home borders the Hawk Property. The development was going to have a direct impact on not only my husband and I, but also my neighbors as far as how we are able to utilize our land for relaxation, repose and
our direct connection to nature. It would also have a huge impact on the flora and fauna in the area. At the public hearing in January of 2014, then mayor Margaret Harto proclaimed that the goal of the city was “To save as many trees as possible”. Those were her direct words, which she spoke with confirmed countenance. I was planning on standing at the podium that night and giving testimony about our concerns for the fate of the greenbelt. But I chickened out and did not take those ten steps up to the microphone, a decision that has weighed heavy on my mind in the following years.

So, in July of 2016 I figured there may still be time to get involved with speaking up for protecting that green space. That was when we found out about the hotel. The original plan of cutting back the greenbelt to 20’ and having a parking lot and hotel 20 feet from our property was like a punch in the gut. The developer proposed that in early 2016, and we were never informed of it. In all of my thoughts and concerns, that certainly was the last thing myself or any of our neighbors expected.

This is the view from our bedroom window:

![Image of the view from the bedroom window]

Bear in mind that is roughly 100’ of greenbelt. It will be reduced by 30’ to accommodate a parking lot, so effectively the four-story hotel will be at the edge of the first set of trees- not the ones you can see the tops of in the distance. These are tall trees with lots of overhead canopy for nesting hawks, and even hummingbirds as well as provide habitat for bees, and other woodland creatures. That being said, there isn’t much lower foliage to block the view of the hotel, or block out noise or air pollution.

So started my plight to preserve the greenbelt and ask for the hotel to be moved to another location closer to the business area of LUV. Attending many city council and planning commission meetings over the last 7 months has been an incredible experience. I have learned a lot about the decision-making process of the city. I have met lots of great people who have been an inspiration. I have also come to realize that the more I found out, the more I didn’t really know, and that many of my neighbors were in the same boat. Worse yet, many citizens were unaware of what was going on at all.

The location of the hotel and the preservation of the greenbelt are still a high priority for me. They are direct and tangible effects of LUV. But in learning about what the actual Development Agreement could do to the town is becoming very concerning.
My husband bought the house in 1997 when he first moved to the area when Covington was a quiet, rural area back then, on the cusp of incorporation. It had a small-town community feel to it, plenty of natural surroundings with abundant and healthy flora and fauna. And traffic wasn’t anywhere close to the problem it is now. When I moved into the house in 2004, Covington was in the midst of growing. There were burgeoning new businesses, Wal-Mart, Costco and Kohl’s went in shortly after, as well as a few restaurants that made it a convenient alternative to driving to Kent Station or Southcenter.

IT WAS DEVELOPING BUT IT WAS STILL A CITY IN BALANCE AND SOMETHING HAS CHANGED.

We can all look around and see the Puget Sound growth. It is affecting everybody, everyday, in every way. While the Pacific Northwest has seen influx of residents that can’t be helped, there is also an attitude the “If you build it, they will come”. Covington City Council has decided that the best course of action for its citizens is to go for MAXIMUM GROWTH! The projections used in the city plan are for the maximum allowable, even after the PSRC said it is too aggressive and needs to be scaled back. The direct response from Richard Hart, according to his report to the Planning Commission at their January 19th, 2017 meeting was “We’re not going to do that” because we have to take into consideration property owners’ rights. As Mr. Hart explained, we don’t want to run the risk of exposing the city to legal action by property owners because of scaling back in the middle of the permitting process. Frankly, if we have entered into agreements, or already given permits, it is done and that is that. I fully understand that.

However, now is the time to make sure that we look at what we haven’t fully entered into yet, and I am talking about the Lakepointe Urban Village Development Agreement (DA) between the city and Oakpointe. The PSRC re-evaluated the conditions in the region and saw how things are progressing. They stepped back and said “Ooops, after further review, there is too much strain on infrastructure and environment and Covington needs to lower the growth numbers.” Did they do this because they are mad at Covington? Or someone has political grudge? Maybe, but not likely. But I’m placing money that their reason is because they see what the citizens see, and the city either cannot or is choosing not to see: That our rate of development will lead to overcrowding and the problems of traffic, crime and environmental impact. We are already feeling these effects with the additional 400 living units inhabited in the past 2 years, still 350 more to be completed in the near future, and then 1000-1500+ units coming down the pipeline with Lakepointe Urban Village (LUV).

The primary argument in favor of growth is that it will allow for more revenue, which the city needs to keep things running. However, allowing more growth to get more money only creates a vicious circle, because the more growth you have, the more money you need to support infrastructure, policing, schools, etc.. The other view in favor of rapid growth is that there will be more jobs, with the city’s goal of more “family-wage jobs”. However, many of the jobs that will be created are retail and service or restaurant jobs. These are not family-wage positions.

If we lock ourselves into a 15-year (or 20 year if the developer chooses) agreement, we have VERY LITTLE SAY and VERY LITTLE FLEXIBILITY in what goes in regards to a huge development. And while there will be benefits to LUV, there will also have an offsetting negative impact on the quality of life in our town. If the PSRC steps back every few years to see how things are progressing in the big picture, it is proof that this type of reflection and evaluation is VERY PERTINENT and critical to RESPONSIBLE GROWTH MANAGEMENT.

If the DA gets signed as it currently is, it will lock in favorable conditions for the developer(s) that will very likely have negative impact on our city. They will have a lot of freedom as far as when and where things are built, and are being given lots of concessions with regards to zoning - all making things easier to get built. On
one hand, this will drive efficiency and cost-effectiveness throughout the development project, both for the developer and the city. However, when it comes to the big picture...... IF THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC CLIMATE CHANGES AT ALL IN THE NEXT 15-20 YEARS, THE CITY CAN DO VERY LITTLE TO REIN IN DEVELOPMENT. IF A FUTURE COUNCIL DECIDES TO REVISIT THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OR MUNICIPAL CODE AND RE-CALIBRATE GROWTH RATES OR ZONING, WE CAN DO NOTHING AS IT RELATES TO LAKEPOINTE URBAN VILLAGE.

Citizens are already complaining about growth, traffic, and the changing face of Covington. This DA is not going to help mitigate the concerns of the voters and residents. Specifically, the only way the city (or more importantly, the public), can get involved with any changes to the DA is a “Major Amendment” to it - if it is initiated by Oakpointe. There are few scenarios that applies to, and the only thing called out specifically is if Oakpointe wanted to exceed the maximum trip threshold by increasing the number of housing units or retail space it develops. (So essentially if they want to build even more). The city cannot initiate any of these changes unless there is negligence or breach of contract on the part of the developer.

We have seen what happens when a city locks into a long-term agreement and then realizes after it is too late, that they made a mistake and have upset their citizens. They cannot go back and undo it. There are legal consequences- as evidenced by what is happening in Black Diamond.

There are still concerns about greenbelt and natural space protections, general safety concerns, policing, traffic congestion, school crowding, and zoning that does not protect nearby neighborhoods and preserve their way of life. These are issues that should have been clearly addressed initially in the DA. At the Planning Commission hearing on March 16th, these were all questions asked of city staff, who referred them to Oakpointe’s attorney rather than answering themselves, which should never happen if there is any concern for the community. If an independent review has been done, that information should be made available and the city staff should know those answers if we are to make an informed decision. I want to be 100% sure we aren’t missing out on anything that could cause problems later. And I share this concern with other Covington citizens and voters.

I understand that the city staff, developer, and council has put a lot of time into working up the DA and all of the associated evaluations, determinations, and recommendations surrounding the development and the agreement. However, as has become very apparent, regardless of what has been said on the subject, there has not been enough public input in this process until very recently, when a handful of us began informing others of what was going on.

I am recommending that the city council hold off on signing the Development Agreement (DA) as it currently is, and allow for more citizen input and collaboration on the DA to be absolutely sure it is in the best interest of the city. There are also questions being raised as to how the effects of traffic, schools, and crime have been evaluated. The developer will not be breaking ground on their property for several more years at least. There is no reason to rush into this DA without more vetting being done.

I know that as I write this, additions are being made based on some of our concerns that have been voiced over the last month. That is a great step in the right direction, but more time is needed to make sure that the citizens are also comfortable with the DA, since they will be the ones living with the results of it.
Best Regards,
Elizabeth Porter
Thank you for the email to the City Council. Your comments will be entered into the public record for the hearing on April 11.

Sharon

Sharon Scott  
Executive Assistant/City Clerk  
City of Covington  
16720 SE 271st Street, Suite 100  
Covington, WA 98042  
phone: 253-480-2405  
fax: 253-480-2401  
website: www.covingtonwa.gov
current population of our city, I would hope that clearly stated measures to protect our city and residents (present and future) would be part of any Development Agreement.

I am urging you, as our representatives, please do not rush the Development Agreement with Oakpointe/Lakepointe!
We, as a city, should take our time and make sure that things are the way we like them, before we allow a developer to do dictate the rules based on a company’s profit.

First, I am VERY concerned about the undoubted traffic problems on already congested 272nd, the very inadequate two-lane Wax Road, and two-lane 256th Street which even has portions lacking sidewalk and a somewhat dangerous roundabout for Kentwood High School students walk to and from school! Further, both Wax Road and 256th Street lead to roundabouts, which are already increasing in traffic during commuting hours. These will become major thoroughfares for both residents of the LUV as well as those hoping to enjoy the shops and theater. If we wait for the DOT to take action, there will be years of traffic frustrations before any action will be taken.

Secondly, I am distressed that the Oakpointe/Lakepoint developer is ALREADY trying to reduce the green spaces in the LUV. These are critical to the health of our city and the development, and will only increase its future value to any homeowners there. If we want the LUV to contribute to Covington both ecologically and financially by protecting green spaces and preserving or planting as many trees as possible.

Thirdly, the burden on schools and emergency services will become an issue quickly. Please make provisions for these critical services clear within the Development Agreement, rather than forcing public servants such as teachers, fire fighters and police officers to bear unnecessary burden.

On our city website, it states that Covington intends to be a “City of Greatness”. If that really is the case, let’s take the needed time to make sure that we are making it so, rather than allowing a for-profit company to take that out of our hands.

Sincerely,
Elizabeth Ott
(Covington homeowner and resident since 2013)
From: Ann Mueller  
Sent: Monday, April 10, 2017 7:18 PM  
To: Sharon Scott  
Subject: FW: Questions regarding Lakepointe FEIS

Can you include this in the Addendum with the other comments you get tomorrow it wasn’t addressed directly to the CC but came to me. (Note I’ve attempted to arrange a time to talk with her on the phone but have spoken with her.)

From: Elaine K [mailto:raische@hotmail.com]  
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2017 4:26 PM  
To: Ann Mueller <amueller@covingtonwa.gov>; Richard Hart <rhart@covingtonwa.gov>  
Subject: Questions regarding Lakepointe FEIS

Dear Ann and Richard,

I’m a resident of Covington (within 500 feet of the proposed Lakepointe Urban Village), and I have a few questions relating to the Lakepointe Urban Village FEIS. May I please run these by you?

- The EIS states: "Despite significant increases in impervious surface area, Alternatives 2 and 3 minimize adverse impacts through … largely avoiding critical area impacts [and] maintaining a native primarily forest buffer".
  - Could it please be clarified where this “native primarily forest buffer” is located?
  - How are critical area impacts are being avoided when it seems the bulk of the area is classified a “critical aquifer recharge area”?
  - If the area features native forest, why is the land being considered pasture for the purposes of the EIS?

- I’m finding contradictory classifications for the wetland area in the NE portion of the property in question.
  - Why were two different studies were done by two different companies just a year apart?
  - Which version, and what wetland rating(s) and score(s) are currently being used for planning and permitting?

- It seems there is a requirement to put up "a notice that the subject property is within or near designated agricultural lands, forestlands, or mineral resource lands on which a variety of commercial activities may occur that are not compatible with residential development for certain periods of limited duration", as per RCW 36.70A.060. Has that been done? (http://app.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=36.70A.060)

- The EIS states that "Noise levels at the wetland system in the north portion of the study area will be dominated by traffic on SR 18 and would remain the same. Therefore, Alternative 3 would not affect the wetland." A stated goal of the developer is to make the new 850,000 square feet of retail space and 1,500 new housing units immediately off of SR-18 a “destination” for people from surrounding areas. This will obviously mean additional trips along SR-18 from outlying areas to Lakepointe (and return trips back again). An increase in traffic volume will, of course, mean additional noise produced by SR-18. The noise study does not address this, and instead assumes a consistent noise level of 50 decibels for every development alternative. Could you please address this inconsistency?

- Finally, the EIS states that "No impacts from traffic-related noise will occur at the existing residential neighborhood south of the mine site." Could you please clarify how this calculation was made, particularly given the proposed reduction of the existing tree buffer and addition of a four-story
hotel adjacent to existing houses? I wondered if this might have been concluded before the hotel was put on the plans, and if a re-assessment is needed now.

Thank you so much for your time!

--Elaine K.