



Transportation Concurrency Level of Service Standards Update EIS Scoping Summary August 28, 2020

I. Introduction

The City of Sammamish is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to evaluate potential significant environmental impacts associated with possible changes to transportation level of service (LOS) standards and concurrency requirements. The proposal consists of related amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and Sammamish Municipal Code necessary to amend and implement the City's transportation LOS standards and concurrency management program. The legislative action, if taken, would apply to all areas within the City's boundaries.

Three alternatives are proposed, including the No Action Alternative. Principal features of each alternative are noted below:

Alternative 1 (No Action). Comprehensive Plan Glossary and Transportation Element amendments adopted in Ordinance No. 02018-464 and implementing Municipal Code amendments for intersection LOS standards and concurrency management program adopted in Ordinance No. 02018-465.

Alternative 2 (Proposed Action). Comprehensive Plan and implementing Municipal Code amendments to add LOS standards and concurrency requirements for key roadway corridors and segments. Proposed intersection standards would remain as described in the No Action Alternative.

Alternative 3. Alternative 3 includes two options that bracket the Alternative 2 LOS standards for the key roadway corridors and segments with more stringent (Option a) and less stringent (Option b) LOS standards. Alternative 3 is otherwise the same as Alternative 2.

II. EIS Review and Scoping

As described in WAC 197-11-400, the purpose of an EIS is to ensure that environmental information is available, in conjunction with other relevant materials and considerations, to public agencies to plan actions and make decisions. An EIS is an environmental disclosure document and is not a permit or engineering document. As described in the SEPA Rules, the purpose of an EIS is best served by short documents that are concise, clear, and supported by necessary environmental analysis.

Scoping is the process of identifying the elements of the environment to be evaluated in an EIS. Scoping is intended to help identify and narrow the issues to those that are significant. The scoping process includes a public comment period so that the public and agencies can comment on key issues and concerns. Following the comment period, the City considers all comments received and determines the scope of review for the environmental analysis (WAC 197-11-408).

The City of Sammamish issued a Determination of Significance (DS) / Scoping Notice for the Transportation Concurrency Level of Service Standards Update proposal on July 7, 2020 (Attachment 1) and made it available to the public through a variety of methods, including the following:

- *Notice to the Seattle Times, published on July 7, 2020*
- *Email notice to state and local agencies and to citizens who have requested to be notified, totaling 24 notices*
- *Mailed notice to state and local agencies and to citizens who have requested to be notified, totaling 26 notices*
- *Publication in the City's newsletter: delivered to 9,306 persons and viewed by an estimated 40 persons*
- *Announcement at City Council (July 7, 2020) and Planning Commission meetings (July 16, 2020)*
- *Connect Sammamish website notice, viewed an estimated 43 times*
- *Twitter and Facebook postings: 1,281 views on Twitter and 1,800 views on Facebook*

The Scoping Notice expressed the City's initial expectation that the EIS would consider potential impacts associated with water resources (water quality, stormwater), plants and animals (fish), land use, plans and policies, population and housing, and transportation.

Through the Scoping Notice, the City invited public and agency comment on that expectation and on the proposal, alternatives, and elements of the environment to be considered in the EIS. Comment was invited via email, postal mail, and JotForm, a web-based comment form. The 21-day scoping period was originally scheduled to close on July 28, 2020. However, because JotForm was unavailable for several hours between July 27, 2020 and July 28, 2020, the City extended the comment period to July 31, 2020. The City included notice of this extension on its project webpage on Connect Sammamish as well as a note on the JotForm page itself.

By the close of the scoping period, the City received a total of 69 comments, comprised of a combination of emails, letters and JotForm comments addressing a variety of issues and concerns. Comments are summarized in Section III (Table of Summarized Comments) in this document. All emails, letters and JotForm comments can be found at the Connect Sammamish website: <https://connect.sammamish.us/gmhb-remand>. A list of all commenters and topics addressed in their comments is included as Attachment 2.

As noted above, Section III consists of a summary of comments and responses, organized by topic. The responses identify topics raised by the commenters that are included in the EIS, what topics are not included and why, and respond to other questions raised in the comments. All comments provided through the scoping process may be considered, as appropriate, in EIS preparation and/or future planning efforts.

Comments that were reviewed and noted but did not result in a change to the scope of the EIS generally fall into the following categories:

- *Comments that expressed opinions, raised questions, or made general suggestions. In general, these comments did not address the scope of the EIS but are noted for information and, as appropriate, may be considered in EIS preparation or future planning efforts.*
- *Comments that suggested the expansion of the proposal to include changes to land use patterns, zoning designations, housing densities, housing types, or other additions. As described in the Scoping*

Notice and description of the proposal above, the proposal is focused on transportation level of service standards. Proposals for change to land use, housing and other issues are not included in the proposal, although impacts of the proposal on land use and housing will be considered in the EIS. In addition, changes to land use, housing or zoning designations may be identified as potential mitigation to impacts identified in the EIS.

- *Comments that identified issues that are already within the scope of the EIS. These are noted under the responses for each environmental topic in Section III.*

Following an analysis of scoping comments and available information, the City identified several new topics that should be included in the scope of the EIS. These are as listed below and have been added to the scope of the EIS.

- *Earth: Steep slope/landslide hazard*
- *Natural Environment: water quantity, tree canopy*
- *Land Use/Plans and Policies: transfer of development rights*
- *Transportation: evacuation routes, transportation related GHG emissions*

While the scope of the EIS is not expected to change substantially beyond the original and added scope identified above, the comments provided will be taken into account as appropriate in the course of EIS preparation.

Attachments

1. Determination of Significance/Scoping Notice
2. List of Commenters

III. Table of Summarized Comments

EIS Topic	Comments	Response
Alternatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Define proposal consistent with SEPA requirements. ▪ Describe proposal in terms of objectives. ▪ Proposal objectives should emphasize housing choices and affordability. ▪ Provide a range of alternatives to allow meaningful comparison of alternatives. ▪ Alternatives should include different V/C standards. ▪ LOS standards so restrictive no reasonable way to pass, contrary to WAC. ▪ Drop V/C standard and rely on intersection-based concurrency. ▪ Alternatives should not be limited to one citywide standard. ▪ Identify specific transportation projects necessary to meet identified LOS standards. ▪ Address concurrency issues for the northern section of East Lake Sammamish Parkway. ▪ Consider more cost-effective solutions to the City’s goal. ▪ Concurrency regulations should include transit and rideshare service vehicles. ▪ No action alternative should be the preferred alternative. ▪ Consider alternative to alleviate long standing imbalances in housing supplies, economic supplies, and transportation systems within Sammamish by optimizing land uses (Enrich & Sustain platform). ▪ Emphasis should be placed on providing a range of housing choices and affordability. ▪ Consider down-zoning throughout the city to maintain limited growth. 	<p><i>The description of alternatives will identify objectives of the proposal. The EIS will include three alternatives, including a No Action alternative; action alternatives will vary level of service standards to allow for meaningful comparison. Transportation projects required as a result of different level of service standards will be identified and no exemptions to concurrency requirements are assumed.</i></p> <p><i>As part of the alternatives description, the EIS will identify potential capital costs and funding sources associated with the projects that support each alternative. While the EIS will not evaluate cost implications or cost effectiveness as part of the environmental analysis, it is anticipated that this information will be reviewed and considered as part of the City decision-making process on the proposal.</i></p> <p><i>Concurrency is required for locally owned transportation arterial facilities. Sammamish does not own or control transit or rideshare service vehicles and does not require concurrency for these services.</i></p> <p><i>The No Action is included as one of the alternatives. All alternatives will receive comparable analysis and consideration.</i></p> <p><i>The proposal considered in the EIS is focused on citywide transportation level of service standards and concurrency requirements. Changes land use, zoning, or housing supplies are not proposed, but impacts of the proposal and alternatives on land use and housing will be considered in the analysis. In addition, changes to land use, housing or zoning designations may be identified as potential mitigation to impacts identified in the EIS.</i></p>

EIS Topic	Comments	Response
Determination of Significance (DS) and Environmental Checklist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ DS does not provide description of probable significant adverse impacts. ▪ DS should provide more specific description of alternatives. ▪ Comments on responses to Environmental Checklist, including responses to Air, Animals, Land/Shoreline Use, Housing. 	<p><i>As required in WAC 197-11-360 and consistent with the form in WAC 197-11-980, the DS describes the main elements of the proposal, location of the proposal, and main areas identified for discussion in the EIS. For additional information about the proposal, an Environmental Checklist was attached.</i></p> <p><i>Comments provided on the Environmental Checklist will be addressed in the EIS.</i></p>
General EIS scope and analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fully evaluate No Action alternative. ▪ Gather relevant information about future city growth and needs to accommodate growth. ▪ Consider environmental impacts of roadway expansion. ▪ EIS should have broad scope. ▪ Consider environmental impacts on adjacent jurisdictions, including land capacity, housing, and transportation facilities. 	<p><i>All alternatives, including the No Action alternative, will be fully evaluated based on relevant growth information based on data from local, regional, and state sources.</i></p> <p><i>The DS identifies the initial proposed scope for the EIS, which has been finalized through this EIS scoping process.</i></p> <p><i>The proposal does not include changes to land capacity or housing in Sammamish. If impacts to adjacent jurisdictions are identified as a result of the proposal and alternatives, these impacts and mitigating measures will be identified.</i></p> <p><i>The DS/scoping notice was sent to adjacent jurisdictions and notice of the Draft EIS will also be circulated to these jurisdictions for their review and comment.</i></p>
Communication and outreach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How many comments were received? ▪ Information lacking; need more ways to inform public. ▪ Hold discussion of transportation concurrency and modeling in public forum. ▪ Provide outline of public participation process. ▪ Well informed citizen input is needed. ▪ Make more than usual effort to solicit public comment. ▪ Conduct survey to see what residents want; statistically valid survey has not been done. 	<p><i>The City received a total of 69 comments from 53 individuals, groups, and agencies. Please see https://connect.sammamish.us/gmhb-remand for the full list of comments.</i></p> <p><i>Methods used to publicize the DS and scoping period included a variety of channels, as listed below. Where performance metrics for methods are available, they are noted below.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Notice to the Seattle Times, published on 07/07/20 ▪ Email notice to state and local agencies and to citizens who have requested to be notified, totaling 24 notices ▪ Mailed notice to state and local agencies and to citizens who have requested to be notified, totaling 26 notices

EIS Topic	Comments	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Publication in the City’s newsletter: delivered to 9,306 persons, 40 total views ▪ Announcement at City Council (07/07/20) and Planning Commission meetings (07/16/20) ▪ Connect Sammamish website notice, 43 total views ▪ Twitter and Facebook postings: 1,281 views on Twitter and 1,800 views on Facebook <p><i>The City continually strives to find methods to provide timely information to residents in the formats they are comfortable with and welcomes suggestions for other methods.</i></p> <p><i>The next formal opportunity to comment on the EIS process will occur following issuance of the Draft EIS. Public comment is invited during a 30-day comment period. A public meeting will be held during the comment period to provide an overview of EIS findings, answer questions, and take comments.</i></p> <p><i>In addition to the EIS comment period, the Planning Commission will hold a public hearing on the staff recommendation that moves forward following environmental review. Following the public hearing, the Planning Commission will make a recommendation to City Council. The City Council will review the recommendation at a public meeting and hold a public hearing prior to making their decision.</i></p> <p><i>A survey is not proposed or required for the EIS process.</i></p>
Natural Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Address water quantity. ▪ Consider stormwater. ▪ Consider downstream impacts of development and increased impervious surfaces on wetlands, watershed, landslide hazard and other water management issues. ▪ Include analysis of indirect impacts on orcas. ▪ Consider loss of native species. 	<p><i>As proposed, the scope of the natural environmental analyses includes water quality and plants and animals, with an emphasis on fish habitat.</i></p> <p><i>Based on comments received, consideration of water quantity, potential impacts to steep or unstable slopes, and tree canopy will be added to the scope of the EIS.</i></p>

EIS Topic	Comments	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consider CARA, wildlife habitat corridors ▪ Consider impacts of road widening to habitat, community fabric, traffic congestion. ▪ Analyze all existing fish passage barriers and a plan to replace these barriers, particularly when roadways need to be redeveloped/modified and/or when culverts need replacement. ▪ Analyze potential impacts to steep and unstable slopes. ▪ Consider tree canopy. 	
Land Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consider land use. ▪ Consider impacts on Town Center. ▪ Consider impacts of road widening to habitat, community fabric, traffic congestion. ▪ Evaluate whether alternatives support densities to efficiently provide transit service. 	<p><i>As proposed, topics to be addressed in the land use analysis include land use patterns, mix of uses, land use compatibility, and land use targets. Potential land use impacts of the proposal on Town Center will be evaluated. The analysis will also consider the impacts of the proposal and alternatives on the feasibility of development in multifamily areas.</i></p> <p><i>The proposal does not include changes to land capacity or housing in Sammamish. However, impacts of the proposal and alternatives on land use and housing will be considered in the analysis. In addition, changes to land use, housing or zoning designations may be identified as potential mitigation to impacts identified in the EIS.</i></p>
Plans and Policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concurrency and LOS should support the comprehensive plan, rather than the other way around. ▪ Consistency with goals of Growth Management Act. ▪ Ensure CP includes policies to mitigate impacts. ▪ Consistency with City's Housing Strategy Plan ▪ Consider impacts to Comprehensive Plan conservation and sustainability goals. ▪ Address impacts of policy and regulatory changes on adjacent jurisdictions. 	<p><i>As proposed, the plans and policies analysis will address consistency of the proposal and alternatives with the Growth Management Act, Puget Sound Regional Council regional policy guidance, King County Countywide Planning Policies, Sammamish Comprehensive Plan, and other related city plans.</i></p>

EIS Topic	Comments	Response
Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impact on ability to produce housing ▪ Impacts on housing supply, variety, affordability, special needs housing, housing to serve all economic segments of the community. ▪ Evaluate impacts on multifamily housing options. ▪ Clearly state population assumptions. ▪ Compare the alternatives based on impacts to enable an array of housing choices that meet housing needs of low- and moderate-income households. ▪ Consider indirect impacts related to demolition and development of affordable housing. ▪ Include anti-displacement measures that will ensure development without displacement and identify innovative housing mitigation measures in case of demolition. ▪ Impacts on housing supply and demand in adjacent cities ▪ Conduct a housing and commercial business needs assessment. ▪ Align residential growth with transportation access. ▪ Consider all housing options. ▪ Look at broader set of options that allows long term residents to stay in community. 	<p><i>As proposed, topics to be addressed in the housing analysis include housing inventory, types and mix, affordability, diverse housing types, housing targets and consistency with the City's Housing Strategy Plan and Housing Element. Potential indirect impacts of demolition and displacement will be included in the housing analysis.</i></p> <p><i>The proposal does not include changes to housing targets or capacity in Sammamish. If impacts to adjacent jurisdictions are identified as a result of the proposal and alternatives, impacts and mitigating measures will be identified.</i></p> <p><i>An assessment of housing will be conducted as noted above. An assessment of commercial business needs will not be conducted, although the land use analysis will address potential impacts to commercial areas as a result of the proposal and alternatives.</i></p> <p><i>The proposal and alternatives propose changes to the City's transportation level of service standards and concurrency regulations. Changes to residential densities, growth patterns and housing options are not proposed, but impacts of the proposal and alternatives on residential patterns and options will be considered in the analysis. In addition, changes to land use, housing or zoning designations may be identified as potential mitigation to impacts identified in the EIS.</i></p>
Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Describe drive-time impacts of each alternative compared to roadway construction. ▪ Impacts on walking, bicycling and transit ▪ Analyze transportation facilities needed to meet new concurrency standards. ▪ Consider evacuation routes from the City ▪ Analyze chokepoints outside of the City, including 202/Sahalee Way NE, SR 202, SR 202/244th Ave NE, East Lake Sammamish 	<p><i>As proposed, the transportation analysis in the EIS will evaluate vehicular level of service, transit, bicycle and pedestrian movement, and freight mobility. The analysis will include a description of baseline conditions and plans, together with evaluation of impacts to each mode of travel for each alternative. Potential impacts on adjacent areas will also be considered. As part of the evaluation, the impact of lower traffic volumes, such as those experienced as a result of COVID-19 will be considered.</i></p>

EIS Topic	Comments	Response
	<p>Parkway NE/Redmond Way, the 520 on-ramp, 228th Ave NE/SE 43rd Way, SE Issaquah Fall City Road/Issaquah Pine Lake Road SE, SE 56th St/NW Sammamish Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure capacity of roadways is adequate. ▪ Consider impacts of road widening to habitat, community fabric, traffic congestion. ▪ 2035 traffic volumes should account for impact of COVID on long-term travel patterns. ▪ Address capital facilities impacts outside of city, particularly improvements that would increase the segment/corridor capacity of city roadways upstream. ▪ Include analysis of regional statistics and projected LOS. ▪ Consider whether transportation amendments will induce demand and impacts of induced demand. Compare transportation usage by housing type. ▪ Account for vehicle and non-vehicle trips between adjacent Town Center TAZs. ▪ Add 35% reduction to ITE rates in mixed use settings for residential uses. ▪ Consider the Transportation Master Plan and Transportation Improvements Plan. ▪ Include level of service standards for transit routes required by RCW 36.70A.070(6(a)(ii)(B)); consider impacts of the amendments on LOS standards. ▪ Include analysis on ensuring the reduction of parking minimums for housing near future and existing transit and bus rapid ride hubs. ▪ Evaluate cost implications of new LOS standards, including new roadways and long-term fiscal responsibilities. 	<p><i>Based on comments received, consideration of potential impacts to evacuation routes from the City will be added to the scope of the EIS.</i></p> <p><i>Transportation model assumptions for different land use types, including a reduction for trips in mixed-use areas will be described in the EIS. The potential for induced demand will be considered.</i></p> <p><i>The EIS will consider relevant information from the City's draft Transportation Master Plan. However, the proposal and alternatives do not include, and the EIS does not analyze, future City action on the Transportation Master Plan.</i></p> <p><i>Transportation level of service standards are required for locally owned arterial transportation facilities. Sammamish does not own or control transit or rideshare service vehicles and does not have levels of service standards for these facilities. The EIS will identify applicable Sound Transit and King County Metro level of service standards applicable to the City.</i></p> <p><i>Changes to parking standards are not proposed and are not anticipated to be analyzed in the EIS. There are no bus rapid ride hubs in the City.</i></p> <p><i>As part of the alternatives description, the EIS will identify potential capital costs and funding associated with the projects that support each alternative. While the EIS will not evaluate cost implications as part of the environmental analysis, it is anticipated that this information will be reviewed and considered as part of the City decision-making process on the proposal.</i></p>

EIS Topic	Comments	Response
GHG Emissions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Analyze potential impacts on GHG emissions 	<p><i>Based on the comments received, transportation related GHG emissions will be considered in the EIS.</i></p>
Equity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Disclose equity and affordability impacts of different LOS standards. ▪ Equity analysis of current City policies and impacts on affordability, including review of R1 zoning, and current housing stock. ▪ Equity analysis of proposal on housing choice and affordability. 	<p><i>The EIS housing analysis will describe existing housing inventory and housing targets and evaluate potential impacts to housing diversity and affordability under each of the alternatives.</i></p>
Schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evaluate assumed student generation factors based on Sammamish-specific data. 	<p><i>The Draft EIS will be made available to the public schools in Sammamish for review and comment on the analysis.</i></p>
Transfer of Development Rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consider impacts on ability to accommodate transfers of development rights, including Comprehensive Plan policies, interlocal agreement with King County, benefits of TDR. ▪ Consider TDR impacts of proposal on Town Center, including indirect impacts to agricultural/forest resource lands in the TDR program. 	<p><i>Based on comments received, potential impacts to the City's TDR program, including consistency with Comprehensive Plan policies for transfer of development rights will be considered in the Plans and Policies analysis.</i></p>
Town Center	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Subjective V/C concurrency program will have irreversible unintended consequences to the city center. ▪ Concern that action is intended to stop growth and prevent Town Center development. ▪ Analyze how V/C LOS standards impact single family zoning and multifamily Town Center zoning. ▪ Update to Town Center EIS long overdue. ▪ Consider alternatives for Town Center Plan. ▪ Support complete revision to Town Center EIS or a new EIS. ▪ Hold developer accountable to the Town Center Plan. 	<p><i>The EIS will consider potential impacts of the proposal on land use and housing in the City as a whole, including the Town Center. Potential mitigating measures will be discussed for identified impacts.</i></p>

EIS Topic	Comments	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consider an alternative that supports the Town Center Plan. ▪ Revisit whether Town Center is in the best interest of the City. ▪ City’s current plan has lack of information about Town Center. ▪ Enforce LEED silver or above for development in Town Center and all new public use buildings. ▪ Prioritize a denser Town Center over single-family sprawl. 	
General comments and preferences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ EIS is expensive and ignores City’s responsibility to be fiscally prudent. ▪ Support 2020 EIS. ▪ Should not waste time and money on arbitrary policies that no longer reflect the world. ▪ Recommend not changing the Comprehensive Plan with a very subjective V/C methodology. ▪ Support full scope of EIS as shown in proposal. ▪ Opposed to opening up entire Comprehensive Plan. ▪ COVID-19 gives City time to study housing supply and “optimally” set land use to serve community with and after pandemic effects. ▪ Impossible to know if city’s concurrency system will result in improvements to the environment. ▪ Actions City could take to improve environment and fix traffic system: complete missing road connections, encourage east/west road connections; divert from being a bedroom community, create and utilize a TDR program; evaluate over supply of large single-family homes in the City. ▪ Need complete streets, variety of housing, more services and economy that serves needs of citizens. ▪ Capacity numbers heavily based on arbitrary policy subjectivity instead of expert objectivity. 	<p><i>General comments expressed opinions, preferences, and ideas about planning for the future. These comments do not address the scope of the EIS but are noted here for information and, as appropriate, may be considered in EIS preparation.</i></p>

EIS Topic	Comments	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prioritize a commitment to building a transit center and public transportation. ▪ TMP process did not analyze potential impacts of actions. ▪ Council should encourage housing diversity to support diverse population. ▪ Concentrate growth where best served by infrastructure, within walking distance of grocery stores and amenities. ▪ City has no real downtown, little local business ownership. ▪ Support public land use and multifamily housing over single family. ▪ Support parks and open space. ▪ Preserve and add park spaces and trees. ▪ Prioritize equitable housing policy. ▪ Prioritize equitable transit-oriented community development. ▪ Support action steps to a more sustainable and green city. ▪ Set an example for how communities can do their part for the environment. ▪ Eventually become carbon neutral or negative. ▪ Note 100% stormwater retention is most responsible approach for development. ▪ Meet the Growth Management Hearing Board's findings and doing the Environmental Impact Study as needed to scope and compete those activities. ▪ Update code to meet requirements of GMHB order. 	



STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (SEPA)
DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE AND
REQUEST FOR COMMENTS ON SCOPE OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Publication Date: July 7, 2020

Lead agency

City of Sammamish

Agency Contact

Doug McIntyre, Transportation Planner

dmcintyre@sammamish.us

425-295-0628

Agency File Number

POL2020-00331

Description of proposal

The proposal is a set of amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and Municipal Code intended to address transportation level of service standards and capital facilities needs. Proposed amendments include (1) Comprehensive Plan amendments intended to adjust the City's transportation Level of Service Standards (LOS) and related concurrency program, and (2) related Municipal Code amendments that implement amended Comprehensive Plan policy guidance.

Comprehensive Plan amendments are anticipated to focus on the Transportation and Capital Facilities elements, but may include additional elements as needed to achieve internal plan consistency. Comprehensive Plan amendments will include updated policy guidance for LOS standards and updated background information to reflect the City's current transportation network, including maps and tables, concurrency program description, 6-Year Transportation Improvement Program, recommended 20-year transportation improvements, financing program, and other related information.

Municipal Code amendments are anticipated to be focused on Titles 14A and 21A SMC. Municipal Code amendments will amend LOS standards to reflect amended Comprehensive Plan guidance, delete outdated tables, correct definitions and Comprehensive Plan references, and other related actions.

Location

The focus for the proposed Comprehensive Plan and Municipal Code amendments is the entire City of Sammamish within municipal boundaries.

Proponent

City of Sammamish

EIS Required

The City of Sammamish has determined that this proposal is likely to have a significant adverse impact on the environment. An environmental impact statement (EIS) is required under RCW 43.21C.030 (2)(c) and will be prepared. An environmental checklist prepared for this proposal is available for review at Sammamish City Hall, Community Development Department, 801 228th Ave SE, Sammamish and at <https://spaces.hightail.com/space/p7FVt67F34>.

The lead agency has identified the following areas for discussion in the EIS: water resources (water quality, stormwater), plants and animals (fish), land use, plans and policies, population and housing, and transportation.

Alternatives considered in the EIS are anticipated to include no action, consisting of current policies and regulations, and two action alternatives that vary in approaches to adjusting LOS standards and concurrency management.

Scoping

Agencies, affected tribes, and members of the public are invited to comment on the scope of the EIS. You may comment on alternatives, mitigation measures, probable significant adverse impacts, and licenses or other approvals that may be required.

Provide written comments by July 28, 2020 at 5:00 pm. Electronic submittal is preferred. Direct comment to:

<https://form.jotform.com/201746911320043>

~or~

Transportation Level of Service & Capital Facilities
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
City of Sammamish
801 228th Ave SE
Sammamish, WA 98075
ATTN: EIS Scoping Comment

~or~

eis@sammamish.us

RE: EIS Scoping Comment

SEPA Responsible Official: David Pyle, Director
Department of Community Development

Signature David Pyle
(electronic signature or name of signor is sufficient)

Date July 7, 2020

Pursuant to SMC 20.15.130(4) there is no administrative appeal process for this action.

Publication Date: July 7, 2020

Name & Organization	Alternatives	DS/Checklist	EIS Scope/Analysis	Communications and Outreach	Natural Environment	Land Use	Plans and Policies	Housing	Transportation	GHG Emissions	Equity	Schools	Transfer of Development Rights	Town Center	General Comments and Preferences
Mullor, Miki									●			●			
Murphy, Michael King County Water and Land Resources Division						●							●		
O'Farrell, Roisin	●		●	●	●	●									●
Pereyra, Wally					●									●	
Richburg, Julio	●				●			●							●
Seetharaman, Karthik					●	●			●						●
Sims, Kat MBAKS	●	●	●	●		●		●	●		●				●
Sogge, Deborah	●					●		●	●						●
Sogge, Deborah Sammamish Chamber of Commerce		●						●	●				●	●	●
Sogge, Kent	●					●		●	●					●	●
Steele, Lisa			●	●	●	●		●	●						
Steinbis, Sharon					●		●	●	●			●		●	●
Stever, Chandler	●							●							
Stever, Peyton	●				●	●		●	●						●
Stickney, Paul (1)	●		●			●		●	●						●
Stickney, Paul (2)	●					●		●	●						●
Stickney, Paul (3)	●					●		●	●						●
Stickney, Paul (4)	●		●			●		●	●						●
Stickney, Paul (5)									●						●
Stickney, Paul (6)					●	●	●	●	●						●
Stickney, Paul (7)	●		●			●	●	●						●	●
Stickney, Paul (8)	●		●			●		●	●						●
Stickney, Paul (9)	●					●		●							●
Stickney, Paul (10)	●	●					●	●	●					●	●
Stickney, Paul (11)		●				●									
Stickney, Paul (12)		●				●									
Stuart, Cameron					●			●	●	●	●				●
Stuart, Pamela					●		●	●	●	●	●				●

Name & Organization	Alternatives	DS/Checklist	EIS Scope/Analysis	Communications and Outreach	Natural Environment	Land Use	Plans and Policies	Housing	Transportation	GHG Emissions	Equity	Schools	Transfer of Development Rights	Town Center	General Comments and Preferences
Thompson, Kathleen					●	●			●					●	●
Treen, Debbie			●	●	●	●	●	●	●						●
Trohimovich, Tim Futurewise					●	●	●	●	●	●					
Valderrama, Ramiro (1)	●							●							●
Valderrama, Ramiro, (2)					●				●		●			●	●
Valderrama, Sherrie					●				●		●			●	●
Vance, Tom							●	●	●	●				●	
Velasco, Maria					●			●	●						●
Walter, Karen Muckleshoot Indian Tribe Fisheries Division					●										
Whitten, Nancy	●			●		●			●					●	●
Wictor, Mary (1)	●				●	●		●	●				●	●	●
Wictor, Mary (2)	●				●	●		●							
Wictor, Mary (3)															●
Wictor, Mary (4)	●				●	●		●	●						●
Wictor, Mary (5)	●							●	●						●