

RE: Comments on Section 2B 60% Design Plans

Lindsey Ozbolt

Tue 1/17/2017 10:21 AM

To: John and Barbara <drjnbarb@comcast.net>;

Dear Ms. Johnson,

Thank you for contacting the City of Sammamish regarding the current Shoreline Substantial Development Permit Application for East Lake Sammamish Trail Segment 2B (SSDP2016-00415).

Your comments have been received and will be included in the project record. At the close of the comment period, all comments will be compiled and provided to King County for review and response. You will be included in future notices the City issues for this proposal.

Regards,

Lindsey Ozbolt

Associate Planner | City of Sammamish | Department of Community Development
425.295.0527

From: John and Barbara [mailto:drjnbarb@comcast.net]
Sent: Saturday, January 14, 2017 12:50 PM
To: Lindsey Ozbolt <LOzbolt@sammamish.us>
Subject: Comments on Section 2B 60% Design Plans

Linsey-
Attached are my comments.
Thank you for giving them serious consideration and response.

Barbara Johnson

Comments regarding Section 2B of East Lake Sammamish Trail Design

Thank you in advance for giving serious consideration and responding to our input.

The comments are regarding the Pine Lake Creek area, named on pages 20, 52, 71, and 124; or as Wetland 23C, 24A, 24B, LA12 or Station 380 (see snip of page 124 at end).

1. On page 71 of the plan documents there appears to be a proposed earth wall and 4' high cyclone fence to be placed on PRIVATE PROPERTY. The subject property is called Whileaway Court (519710TRCT), and is "jointly owned" by the adjacent property owners. The wall and fencing is being proposed for about 40' over the creek on the west side of Whileaway Court; and a ~15' portion of of the wall and fencing on the east side appear to be in the Whileaway Court tract. Since this is private property, **any construction activity requires the consent of all owners.** This fact was made evident to the City during the recent construction / development activity on the Gill Trust Lots (5197100135, 5197100130, 597100120), resulting in a relocation of drainage onto his property and off of Whileaway Court. **And as one of the parties owning Whileaway, we insist you comply with getting written permission from all owners.**
2. As residents near Pine Lake Creek for 22 years, we have witnessed wetland conditions, excess standing water, and soggy & muddy soil much of the year in Wetlands 24A, 24B, AND to the south of Wetland 24B area designation, extending to Pine Lake Creek. **It confounds us that the area between 24B and Pine Lake Creek is not displayed as wetland presently - because it absolutely IS.**
3. Furthermore, on page 124 of the plans a Wetland buffer is notated for WE23C, but no buffer is noted for Wetland 24B or WC 1428 SF. **We request that it be shown on the plans.**
4. The general area north of Pine Lake Creek is classified as wetlands and is also habitat of deer, raccoons, water fowl, beavers, otters, and the occasion bobcat. The concern we have is that the westerly edge of the new trail will extend about 15' west of its current location into wetland regions. Furthermore, the Clearing and Grubbing line appears to extend between 10' - 20' beyond the current trail west edge. **The plan depicts a loss of natural habitat / wetland preservation, which we request be left untouched.**

Please make a smaller Clearing and Grubbing strip, and expand the Wetland area larger than the WC 1428 SF designation. This will help to maintain wetland and wildlife habitat conditions, without interruption or wildlife displacement.

5. A couple years ago the 3 Lots owned by the Gill Trust (5197100135, 5197100130, 597100120) were cleared, graded and prepared for development. We understand the permitting process required a “no touch” zone on the eastern portion of the subject lots - ranging from 50’ - 75’ of setback buffer from the east property line of the Gill lots. It seems from the site design that the County / City are not being held to the same standard with respect to the development of the trail as the Clearing and Grubbing line indicates only about 30’ “no touch” zone setback from the trail Corridor’s westerly property line. **Why the inconsistent application of “no touch” setbacks in wetland zones?**
6. In the present Trail Corridor, to the west of the existing trail (Wetland 24B and adjacent WC to the south), is a mixture of large aged and rotten deciduous trees, plus younger evergreen trees. There have been consistent problems with the older trees - cottonwoods, willows - as whole trees have fallen or large portions have broken off due to wind, rain, and soft wetland conditions, often blocking the trail. **We request that for safety and ease of maintenance, the construction preparation activity remove the large ailing deciduous trees, while preserving the younger evergreen trees, even if they have established themselves in the Clearing and Grubbing area.**

In addition to our comments, we have a question to the City regarding trail maintenance. Here are our observations and resulting question.

As mentioned above, there have been trees and large portions of trees, primarily deciduous, that have fallen over the trail in the vicinity of Pine Lake Creek. In the past the trees / trunks / large limbs were bucked up into bolts or lengths, and just left in an unsightly pile along the trail. What is the City’s maintenance plan and criteria for leaving all the fallen tree debris alongside the trail vs. hauling away the larger portions for better trail appearance and aesthetics? **The courtesy of a reply would be appreciated.**

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Schulz Johnson

Barbara S Johnson

