

Doug McIntyre

From: kdhuckabay@gmail.com
Sent: Friday, July 31, 2020 11:53 AM
To: EIS
Subject: EIS Scoping Comment, Transportation Level of Service & Capital Facilities

[CAUTION - EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear Mayor Moran and City Councilmembers:

In response to your request for comments on the scope of the environmental impact statement, I do have some corrections and suggestions to the scope and the checklist:

Regarding the Checklist;

1. In section 2 Air **Comment:** What is the planned growth in Sammamish? Specific numbers would help to understand the impact of the two options.
2. In Section 5 **Comment:** Animals, My recollection is that the Kokanee” are not currently on an endangered species list.
3. In Section 8. **Comment:** I suggest specifying PSRC Vision 2040 and Vision 2050 Draft since these are the underpinnings of our regional visioning strategies as to how individual cities and counties coordinate to handle the 1.8 million population increase and significant growth of jobs over the next 30 years in the four county area.
4. In Section 8, (I) **Comment:** This statement no adverse impact but if the V/C methodology is selected it is would have a significant impact and that should be clearly stated
5. In Section 9 Housing.” **Comment:** The PSRC and King County specifically call for meeting the economic and demographic needs of the populace, so would suggest changing the statement to “...all economic **and demographic** segments of the community.”
6. In Section 9 Housing **Comment:** With the V/C methodology, since it is designed to have concurrency test failure for any significant new development, without facilities to mitigate the failure, the city should specify the number and types of homes that would be eliminated. Specifically, the city has very little affordable housing and this should specifically be identified.

Regarding the Scope in general:

1. The LOS standards are so restrictive as to have no reasonable way of passing the concurrency tests. Since this is explicitly contrary to the Washington Administrative Code, the goal would seem to be to change the Comp Plan to allow no further growth.
2. The emphasis should be placed on “providing a range of housing choices and affordability” which includes housing choices for all demographic sectors of Sammamish. There are many Sammamish citizens that would like to downsize and stay in the community when they are no longer interested in maintaining a single family home with a yard.

3. I would recommend not changing the Comp Plan to conform with a very subjective V/C methodology which has had its capacity numbers heavily based on arbitrary policy subjectivity instead of expert objectivity. The Town Center Plan was to absorb about half of the housing and most of the job targets anticipated; this reduces the impacts on existing neighborhoods, while also providing that community center gathering area so central for a residential city to increase walkability and community.

Submitted by Kathleen Huckabay
Former Councilmember and Mayor

KATHLEEN HUCKABAY, CPA
CELL: 425-495-6768

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.