

From: [Kerry Bosworth](#)
To: [EIS](#)
Cc: [City Council](#)
Subject: Draft EIS Comment
Date: Monday, September 27, 2021 11:43:10 AM

[CAUTION - EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Hello City of Sammamish,

I reviewed the Sammamish BLUMA EIS, and I appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback. I appreciate that draft is easy to read and provides useful information about Sammamish intersections, traffic segments, and impact of future projects.

First, I have some feedback on the structure of document.

After reading Volume 1 Section 1, Section 2 repeats almost if not exactly word for word. It seems redundant and time consuming as a reader and for the authors who will need to keep both sections consistent as the draft progresses. Why does section 2 duplicate most of section 1?

Section 1-1 (Page 17) = 2-2 (Page 81)

Section 1-3 (Page 19) = 2-4 (Page 84)

Sections 1-5 to 1-35 (Pages 22 – 51) = Sections 2-9 to 2-37 (Page 89 – 117)

I point the following out because the document is a draft and there is an opportunity to correct.

- Volume 1, 1-34 and 2-36 (Page 50 and 116): Looks like **and** should be **any** here “*The other alternatives do not assume **and** reductions in travel demand because of sustained changes to work from home habits.*”
- Volume 1, 1-57 (Page 73): Capitalize **A** here “... Sammamish. **a**lternatives 3 ... “
- Volume 1, 3-10 and (Page 55 and 128): Looks like **ravel** should be **gravel** here “*Soils disturbed during construction at the west of the intersection of East Lake Sammamish Parkway SE and SE 24th Way could be transported down the steep slope into Lake Sammamish by **ravel**, precipitation, or storm runoff.* “
- Volume 1, 3-11, 3-13 and 3-14 (Page 129, 131 and 132): Looks like **raveling** should be **gravel** here “*Soils disturbed during construction at East Lake Sammamish Parkway SE and SE 24th Way, East Lake Sammamish Parkway (segments 1, 2, and 8), Sahalee Way NE (Segment 9), and Issaquah-Pine Lake Road SE (segments 32 and 33) could be transported laterally and/or down-slope into surface water by **raveling**, precipitation, and storm runoff.*”

Next, I have feedback on the content of the document.

For the sake of transparency, I voted for the three most recent city council candidates. I moved here in mid-2018 and started hearing about traffic, storm water, schools, etc. Afterwards I stayed engaged and continued the process of ramping up on the issues and realized I was sold a platform of fear.

I understand the origin of this study and have been waiting to read the draft. I was shocked at how transparent the objective was in Volume 1, section 1.1 (page 7) which was to change the traffic concurrency method to a volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio, while at the same time shocked at how **not** transparent the overall process has been. No public hearing, City Council saying last Spring they hadn't seen a draft, pre-recorded status update on 9/14/21 Study Session with no Q&A and a Facebook post with comments turned off.

Real people's lives HAVE been affected by the challenges I mention above. Talking to people online and in person is like navigating a field of land mines. Instead of seeing progress over the past three years it's been nothing but shutting everything down, not just in the near-term but any progress for years to come. In doing so another set of people's lives has been intimately impacted by repeat moratoriums. And we can't exclude the other group of residents that also live and pay taxes and may decide to make modest modifications to their homes in the future. At which time they're told they can't even when the code says it's allowed, and 3rd parties are required to come in and point out the code. Case in point, possible errors that contradict code were pointed out regarding stream setbacks in the Stormwater Retrofit at the 9/21/21 City Council meeting during public comment. There are very specific issues to address, and knowledgeable residents are engaged and trying to help. But lately most time spent is in Executive Session and with lawyers.

- Reduce traffic? Design a mix of housing to change traffic patterns. Don't change the calculation to include capacity numbers that are less than measured tube count values (use actual volume).
- Crowded schools? Design a mix of housing to support different stages of life.
- Stormwater issues? Design a mix of housing that shares non-permeable surfaces and collection mechanisms.
- Congestion at city boundaries? Design a mix of commercial amenities to address work/play of residents in the city that send some trips inward or to different parts of the city.
- Rapid growth? That already occurred pre-incorporation from 1980 to 1999 with ~ 15k units and then ~3K over the subsequent 20 years.

The draft includes Alternative 1 on 1-9 (page 25) to address projects that were already identified. Why aren't they in progress or done? I had this question even before it came up at the 9/21/21 City Council meeting.

The other alternatives on 1-12, 1-21, 1-27 also include projects that I've seen on past transportation plans. Those plans are currently on indefinite hold. Trying to solve traffic is an old problem. To which there is no magic solution. Widen the roads? More traffic will fill them.

I use getting to downtown Seattle as one measure. A couple times of month I used to leave the East Side at 5:00 PM. There would always be stop and go traffic at various points along the way, but surprisingly I could always get to my destination by 6:00 PM (often by 5:45 PM). In the future this should be reduced by light rail.

Pre-pandemic, our household tried to do our part to reduce traffic. We always have. My spouse drove to the Bear Creek Park and Ride at 6:20 AM to catch a bus. I worked from home, rode the 269 bus or when going to Seattle after work, drove. The only time I experienced a slowdown (2 minutes) was nearing the turn lane for East Lake High School. Traffic dissipated after that to my destination in Issaquah. Taking the bus was longer, but only because it was constantly late, required 12 minutes of walking to reach it and the route includes going to the Issaquah transit center. At the end of the day, it seems like everyone is trying to get home between 5:00 PM and 6:00 PM (no matter when they arrived at work). For us, the traffic within city limits is always manageable. During all other times traversing the city, I don't experience much traffic. Per the study, the proposed solutions appear to be addressing two peak hours only, 1 in the morning and 1 in the evening 5 days week.

Why not find new and innovative ways to solve the problem? Traffic is a symptom not a solution. Use technology or find out what the community can do to help. Or encourage land use to promote fewer trips required during the peak hours, like senior housing and attainable housing for those working in the city. Over the last two years, much spoken and written public comment has been about **optimizing** as outlined in [Enrich and Sustain](#). I support adding that to the study. We don't know exactly what we need, but we are quick to identify what we don't want. Not seeing that and other feedback from the scoping period incorporated into the study seems like a lost opportunity. Is this a **study** or a **direction**?

Suggestions:

Let's engage with the community and businesses to see how they can help.

- Can we adjust our schedules?
- Can we collaborate with schools or businesses on start/end times or WFH schedules?
- How do we get the community to use public or multi-modal transportation more?
- Does our housing attract a variety of resident types who may create different traffic patterns?

Let's tackle the problems on multiple fronts.

- Let's do the doable projects that we know will make an immediate impact (compared to the 4/5 lane increases).
- Let's do pull-outs for school buses such that after the student's board or exit, a queued-up amount of traffic can pass before the bus continues the route.
- Let's create slow climbing lanes so vehicles can pass.
- Let's invest in technology to let residents and workers commuting to/from Sammamish know where congestion exists and suggest alternate times or routes.
- What other technology can be used?

With increased awareness and impact of climate change, let's be bold and forward thinking, while also implementing targeted incremental changes along the way. Could focusing on how to reduce the climate impact of current traffic yield a side benefit of reducing traffic overall? As far as

incremental updates go, the new traffic light in Issaquah on SE 43rd Way in-front of Providence Point has improved my experience when travelling through there.

Here's what I'm doing to help. I'm discussing history and ideas with people. I applied to a commission. I'm exploring the parks in the city. I go visit places that come up at City Council meetings or social media. When I head back to the office, I will take the 269 North instead of South and plan to get an electric scooter to reduce the overall trip time. On Saturday, I spent the morning volunteering with the Friends of Lake Sammamish. Not only did I help clear blackberries I learned more about the history of the park and the surrounding area. Understanding the past, while living responsibly in the present and focusing on the future is the answer.

Conclusion:

I have no confidence that the projects via alternative 2, 3 or 4 will even take place. Thus, the community may just be left with a traffic concurrency of V/C and land use changes (depending on the alternative chosen) that will quite likely adversely affect the future housing diversity in the city. This is very evident by the fact that the Publics Work director could not answer how many road projects are going on right now during the 9/21/21 City Council meeting.

I urge the City and City Council to stop this study and resume active management of the city. Or continue the study, hold a public hearing and pivot to find innovative ways to solve problems that *provide value, not limit it.*

Respectfully,

Kerry Bosworth
Sammamish, WA

Please be aware that email communications with members of the City Council, City Commissioners, or City staff are public records and are subject to disclosure upon request.