

I wonder if University Place has been consulted.

Best,

Theda

Theda Braddock
Mobile: 253 677 6454
Email: theda_Braddock@msn.com

On Feb 7, 2021, at 10:55 AM, Elizabeth Grasher <elizabeth.grasher@ci.steilacoom.wa.us> wrote:

Good morning,

Ditto from me. Other towns have transportation committees/commissions who work in conjunction with planning commissions. I think a review of traffic, bicycle/pedestrian impact, and compliance with local, regional and state transportation matters is warranted.

Additionally, I have brought up the impact on the tribes and requested they be invited to a meeting as this could impact their use of the waterway. I am hopeful that has happened.

I would also like to request if the developers have documentation for us to review it be submitted prior to the meeting. I know their first presentation by PowerPoint was not made available prior to the meeting to planning commissioners. If this is a reasonable request I would like them to be made aware and I am also happy to voice this in our meeting.

As a volunteer board I am happy to accommodate the needs of the community but I work full time in addition to teaching 2 classes at a university and my schedule is pretty booked. In order for me to have sound information, reviewing documents prior to meetings is in my view best practices.

Thank you.

V/R,

Liz

Elizabeth Grasher, M.S., LMHC, LMFT
Steilacoom Planning Commission

From: Judy Bittenbender <judy.bittenbender@ci.steilacoom.wa.us>

Sent: Saturday, February 6, 2021 4:44 PM

To: Doug Fortner <doug.fortner@ci.steilacoom.wa.us>; Theda B <theda_braddock@msn.com>; Kent Boyle <kentboyle1@yahoo.com>

Cc: Bill Miner <bill.miner@ci.steilacoom.wa.us>; Elizabeth Grasher <elizabeth.grasher@ci.steilacoom.wa.us>; Kent Boyle <kent.boyle@ci.steilacoom.wa.us>; Susan Cable <susan.cable@ci.steilacoom.wa.us>; Theda Braddock <theda.braddock@ci.steilacoom.wa.us>; Bill Miner <bill@minergroup.us>; Susan Cable <bbaunme@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: Comments For The Record

Doug,

I could not agree with Kent, Theda, and Bill more as to their attached below concerns regarding development at the Mill site. This is a seismic shift in zoning for that area, the through fare and the Chambers estuary environment. Can the existing infrastructure (more than just roads) support the development without significant financial upgrades by the Town of Steilacoom and its taxpayers? I think not. I wonder if we are getting the cart before the horse and should be having parallel discussions with Public Works about infrastructure support for this kind of development, and the projected upgrades that Public Works needs to plan for, buget for, in order to make development at the Mill site occur.

I saw a survey crew down on Chamber's road adjacent to the Mill site this last week, I wonder what that was about?

I think we need to talk about these concerns at Monday's meeting and how to proceed.

Judy Bittenbender

From: Kent Boyle <kentboyle1@yahoo.com>

Sent: Saturday, February 6, 2021 1:42 PM

To: Doug Fortner <doug.fortner@ci.steilacoom.wa.us>; Theda B <Theda_Braddock@msn.com>

Cc: Bill Miner <bill.miner@ci.steilacoom.wa.us>; Elizabeth Grasher <elizabeth.grasher@ci.steilacoom.wa.us>; Judy Bittenbender <judy.bittenbender@ci.steilacoom.wa.us>; Kent Boyle <kent.boyle@ci.steilacoom.wa.us>; Susan Cable <susan.cable@ci.steilacoom.wa.us>; Theda Braddock <theda.braddock@ci.steilacoom.wa.us>; Bill Miner <bill@minergroup.us>; Susan Cable <bbaunme@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: Comments For The Record

Bill I totally agree with your observation. If you remember I brought the traffic issue up the first time we met with the developers. It really is a concern that needs to be addressed.

In my opinion what we have seen has been very vague in regards to the overall impact this project will have to our community and its infrastructure.

I spoke with Doug last week on the subject of due diligence which we have seen nothing of.

What will the land allow the developer to do? Once they have that answer what are they going to do? Further how will the changes on that property impact the City of

Steilacoom, and surrounding areas a whole? In my opinion we should have that information, along with a more specific plan of what the developer intends to build before we recommend any change in the zoning to accommodate who knows what. In my opinion allowing a change in zoning without that specific information is putting the cart before the horse. What is the car count now? What will it be at build out? What will be the impact of getting in and out of downtown Steilacoom via Lafayette when the project is complete? What are the environmental issues? Further what's the stability of the hillsides with respect to what the developer wants to construct? These questions need answers before we make a zoning decision that could have a significant impact on our community in the future.

While I am excited about the possibilities of the development of this site and the potential it has to benefit our community I also would encourage us to move slowly and cautiously and make our decisions based on factual information, not on speculation.

Kent Boyle

On Friday, February 5, 2021, 05:39:46 PM PST, Theda B <theda_braddock@msn.com> wrote:

I share Commissioner Miner's comments and add my concern for the number of cyclists who enjoy Chambers Creek Road without the safety of a bike lane.

On Feb 5, 2021, at 4:32 PM, Doug Fortner <doug.fortner@ci.steilacoom.wa.us> wrote:

From Commissioner Bill Miner

From: Bill Miner <bill@minergroup.us>
Sent: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 12:14 PM
To: Doug Fortner <doug.fortner@ci.steilacoom.wa.us>
Subject: Comments For The Record

Doug:

Over the past weeks, I have had occasion to speak with many individuals, both Steilacoom residents and nonresidents, about the proposed Abitibi redevelopment. There is much support for the proposed development, but a single unanimous concern.

That concern is management of traffic.

Clearly, Chambers Creek Road is carrying increased traffic. This is due to the general growth in area population, the development of the Chambers Bay housing area, and the increased transiting through Steilacoom from University Place, Lakewood and elsewhere of vehicles on their way to Dupont or Interstate 5.

It seems apparent that Chambers Creek Road is both fragile and challenged from an engineering perspective for redevelopment. The current and future occupants of dwellings and facilities along this road are but one significant earthquake or winter storm away from total road elimination and isolation.

The developers of this site are proposing to construct residential, commercial and retail facilities that could place an increase of nearly 10% of the current population of the town along this single currently stressed roadway.

As stewards of the public interest, it seems apparent that concurrent with the considerations of the new zoning and development plans and procedures, there should be a clear and visible plan for the management of safe and efficient ingress and egress from this site and along Chambers Creek road.

Without such a plan, from the outset, it seems likely that traffic problems will be addressed as an 'afterthought' when they are painfully apparent to all.

We all recognize the complexity and challenges associated with rebuilding Chambers Creek Road, including the need for involvement of numerous independent entities, each of which have their own interests. Ignoring the obvious traffic issues inherent with this redevelopment plan will likely not make them easier to ultimately resolve.

One common suggestion for addressing this issue is the development of a new access road from above. Perhaps an extension of Farwest/Sentinel Road. There may be a number of possible alternatives.

It is unclear to me what role the Plan Commission does, or should have in addressing this concern. Also, the appropriate timing for raising this issue as the development goes forward. But, it is an issue that needs to be considered and addressed.

Thanks,

Bill Miner