

Lindsey Ozbolt

From: Lindsey Ozbolt
Sent: Friday, January 27, 2017 4:18 PM
To: 'Nate Thompson'
Subject: RE: ELST 60% Plan Homeowner Feedback - 2325 East Lake Sammamish PL SE - Signed Letter

Dear Nate,

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 additional 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: Nate Thompson [mailto:nthompson@weareratio.com]
Sent: Friday, January 27, 2017 8:13 AM
To: Lindsey Ozbolt <LOzbolt@sammamish.us>
Cc: Nate Thompson <nthompson@weareratio.com>; 'alison@microsoft.com' <alison@microsoft.com>
Subject: ELST 60% Plan Homeowner Feedback - 2325 East Lake Sammamish PL SE - Signed Letter

Hello Lindsay,

Please find our feedback on the proposed 60% plans for the ELST attached in signed and scanned form – this is a larger file so I am sending it separately from the source document. We welcome the opportunity to discuss these with you in person, either at the city hall or doing a walk of the property so you can understand our concerns first hand and ask questions. We look forward to your response.

Best,

Nate and Alison Thompson
2325 East Lake Sammamish PL SE
Sammamish, WA 98075

Exhibit 29
SSDP2016-00415
002795

January 27, 2017

Lindsay Ozbolt
Associate Planner
Community Development
801 228th Ave SE
Sammamish, Wa 98075
lozbolt@sammamish.us

Attention: Ms. Lindsey Ozbolt

Subject: East Lake Sammamish Trail Segment 2B

Dear Ms. Ozbolt,

The following are our comments and concerns regarding the recently-released 60% plans for the development of the East Lake Sammamish Trail (ESLT) Segment 2B. On January 25th we spent 30 minutes with King County reviewing the 60% Plans for the East Lake Trail. We discovered and discussed a number of issues that we believe need to be addressed before the City issues any permits for work. For reference, our property is located at 2325 East Lake Sammamish PL SE, Sammamish WA 98075; on the recently-released 60% plans we are located at station 328+00. We appreciate your time in compiling these issues and helping to get to a resolution that makes the trail great for everyone.

We ask that members of the City of Sammamish Council, City of Sammamish City Manager and King County officials visit us, walk the trail and see firsthand these challenges. Overall, we believe the current plan will unnecessarily adversely impact our property, remove access to our property and create an unsafe situation for trail users and for our family. However, with some adjustments, and by working together, these challenges can be resolved.

We kindly ask that the City of Sammamish take these comments and questions into consideration. More specifically, we hope that the City and County put the safety of its citizens first, minimize the impact on Sammamish lakeside residents, and reduce the impact on the environment and the existing trees. Our goal is to partner with you, work towards resolution and do our part to ensure that the trail is a great asset for all.

Our concerns with the plans fall into five (5) categories:

- Safety
- Access
- Landscaping, Trees, Water and Run-off
- Rest Stop
- Ownership

Safety

We want the trail plan to be safe for all users, and residents, and feel that the 60% plan does not meet this goal of a safe environment in several areas:

- 1) Currently the plans do not show fencing being replaced along either side of the trail. This is concerning for several reasons.
 - a. First, on the water side, there is a steep drop to the lake and a significant amount of that is comprised of large boulders and rocks. A trail user veering off the trail onto this slope – especially at any significant speed – will be at risk for grave physical harm. What is the rationale in removing the fencing that is there today, and not replacing it? We request that this is addressed by the current fencing, which was installed at the expense of the community homeowners, to remain in place during and after construction, or,
 - b. replacing the fencing on the water side of the trail with fencing comparable to what is in place today including a gate for access.
 - c. Second, there is no fencing replaced on the uphill side of the trail. We have both small children and pets – the current fence keeps them inside the yard safely. It also keeps trail users on the trail and not in our yard. Providing unfettered access onto the trail from our yard, and into our yard from the trail is not safe for our family, or trail users. We request that this is addressed by replacing the fencing on the uphill side of the trail, or we replace it, with fencing comparable to what is in place today including a gate for access.

Access

The construction period for Segment B is listed as 2 years. During the construction period there will be construction fencing erected along the trail. Our home is bisected from our waterfront dock, cabana, deck, beach, etc. by the trail, and our goal is to partner to minimize disruption and access.

- 1) How will we access our waterfront during the construction period?
- 2) Will the construction fencing be up for the entire construction period, along the entire length of Segment B? If so, we request that this be broken into segments to minimize the disruption of waterfront access for all homeowners living within the Segment B section. Being separated from our waterfront docks, cabanas, beaches and boats for this period of time is not acceptable to us.
- 3) We currently have water and electricity running under the existing trail down to our dock and cabana. We wish to preserve these utilities. We request that the county ensures and commits that these utilities will be preserved, between our home and the waterfront during construction and upon completion of the project. We request that the county adds the location of these utilities into the trail development plan and provides assurances that they will continue functioning during construction and afterwards.
- 4) We have concrete stairs that run down to our waterfront on the west side of the trail. The top of these stairs is shown inside the C&G line. What specifically will happen to the top of our stairs during construction? What will happen to them after construction?

Landscaping, Trees, Water and Run-off

Throughout the trail development process many complaints have been lodged with the City of Sammamish and King County regarding the removal of trees, impacting property owners, disregard with code compliances, and many others.

- 1) The current 60% Tree Preservation Plan does not accurately reflect the major trees located on our property, or those neighboring us to the north or south. Currently there are three old-growth Douglas Fir trees displayed in this plan. They are tagged with numbers 8757, 8758, and

8759 as shown on page TP6 of the Tree Preservation Plan. However, there are a significant number of additional old-growth Douglas Fir trees in the immediate vicinity – as close to the proposed trail as the tagged trees in some cases. Why haven't all of these trees – of similar location, size, species and importance to the local neighborhood – been tagged for preservation? We request that every one of these old-growth Douglas Fir trees adjacent to the trail to be tagged and added to the Tree Preservation Plan, and that they are marked to SAVE as noted with the three trees currently listed.

- 2) Our lower yard sometimes floods as water that runs down the hill to the lake is trapped by the interim trail. How does the current draft design address water run-off and potential flooding on the east side of the trail?
- 3) The enlargement and paving of the trail will generate significant additional run-off from the trail surface itself. How does the current draft design address water run-off from the trail surface?
- 4) The current plans show a pipe funneling runoff into the lake (Outfall #2). What is the proposed elevation of this pipe above the surface level of the lake?
- 5) How big is the drainage pipe coming into catch basin 10?
- 6) What is the proposed landscaping that the county will be installing within the C&G line after construction is completed?

Rest Stop

We are highly concerned about the decision to include a rest stop (note 12) in our yard. We have a number of questions, and for several reasons we urge you to consider removing it or moving its location.

- 1) What are the specifics of a Type 1 rest stop? There are no specifics provided in the plans outside of the rough dimensions noted. What is a Type 1 rest stop?
- 2) What are the criteria utilized to determine locations for rest stops on the trail? How did this location meet those criteria? Can this location be moved to elsewhere on this trail segment that is not in a homeowner's backyard?
- 3) Why was this location chosen when there is another larger – Type 2 – rest stop proposed a very short distance up the trail (AL13 note 13). It should be noted that not only is this location very close to the proposed rest stop in our yard, it is also located in a community property location and not an individual's backyard.
- 4) What is the specific plan for the fill noted around the proposed location of the rest stop?
- 5) We are concerned that the lack of fencing shown in the plans will allow trails users free access to our entire backyard as there is no clear delineation between the trail and our yard, making for an unsafe situation for our family. We request that this is addressed by replacing the fencing on the uphill side of the trail, or we replace it, with fencing comparable to what is in place today including a gate for access.
- 6) We are concerned that a rest stop will generate trash and waste that does not get regularly cleaned up, or cleaned up at all, by the County. How will the County address this?
- 7) We are concerned that a rest stop will generate loitering and questionable uses that puts our family, and neighbors, in danger. How will the County address this risk?
- 8) There is a larger rest stop shown in the 60% plans a short distance to the north, in what's locally called the community beach. What is the rationale, and demonstrated need, to have two rest stops installed so close to each other?

- 9) Nowhere else on the 60% plan do we see a rest stop being proposed in someone's back yard. We request that it is removed from our yard, and either moved or eliminated given the proximity to a much larger rest stop shortly up the trail.

Ownership

We understand that the County owns the former railroad right of way through a quit claim it received. Various portions of the right of way have different legal origins, some portions were by grants from private landowners, some portions are based on the railroad's use of the right of way and acquisition of rights by prescriptive easement or adverse possession, and some portions are based on a specific grant by the Federal Government. Our property is in the latter category. While the scope of what the County acquired may be somewhat uncertain, the United States Supreme Court has recently held in *Marvin M. Brandt Revocable Trust v. United States*, 134 S.Ct. 1257 (2014), that federal grants of property to railroads were the granting of easements, and not fee ownership. So, the most that King County could have acquired by a quit claim deed is an easement. Additionally, the federal Surface Transportation Board is only allowing King County to use the railroad corridor for trail purposes and for an interim period of time. These too are the hallmarks of an easement.

Because the County only has an easement in this section of the right of way, we are entitled to use the property in any way that does not interfere with the County's trail easement. It seems like we have the right to keep and should be able to retain all landscaping and water, electricity and access across the trail because none of these interfere with trail use. Nevertheless, we are supportive of the trail as a community asset and may be willing to give up some of these rights if the County makes modifications based on the concerns in this letter. In any event, the City should not allow the County to exceed its property rights in this particular area where there can be no doubt that the most it acquired was an easement, without accommodation to the homeowners.

We ask the City of Sammamish and King County to modify the trail plans to address the above concerns such that the improved trail is a safe undertaking for both residents and trail users. We believe the trail, properly developed, will be a wonderful community asset for everyone; however, updates are needed to accomplish that goal.


Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments, and we look forward to partnering with you to resolve the concerns we have raised.

Regards,

Nate and Alison Thompson
2325 East Lake Sammamish PL SE
Sammamish, WA 98075

Email:
nate@weareratio.com
alison-thompson@live.com

Cell:
Nate: 206-427-1599
Alison: 206-409-9049

Handwritten signatures of Nate and Alison Thompson. The signature on the left is 'Nate' and the signature on the right is 'Alison Thompson'.

Trail with fence erected by homeowners on water side:



Stairs to Water and fence, both installed by owners:



Stairs to Water and fence, both installed by owners:




Old-Growth Douglas Fir Trees With and Without Tags:



View of Backyard area proposed to be developed into Rest Stop:




View of Backyard area proposed to be developed into Rest Stop, note un-tagged Old-Growth Douglas Fir trees:



View of Trail with wood and metal fencing installed by homeowner:



Overview of Trail bisecting neighborhood:



Lindsey Ozbolt

From: Lindsey Ozbolt
Sent: Friday, January 27, 2017 4:17 PM
To: 'Nate Thompson'
Subject: RE: ELST 60% Plan Homeowner Feedback - 2325 East Lake Sammamish PL SE

Dear Nate,

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: Nate Thompson [mailto:nthompson@weareratio.com]
Sent: Friday, January 27, 2017 8:10 AM
To: Lindsey Ozbolt <LOzbolt@sammamish.us>
Cc: Nate Thompson <nthompson@weareratio.com>; 'alison@microsoft.com' <alison@microsoft.com>
Subject: ELST 60% Plan Homeowner Feedback - 2325 East Lake Sammamish PL SE

Hello Lindsay,

Please find our feedback on the proposed 60% plans for the ELST attached. We welcome the opportunity to discuss these with you in person, either at the city hall or doing a walk of the property so you can understand our concerns first hand and ask questions. We look forward to your response.

Best,

Nate and Alison Thompson
2325 East Lake Sammamish PL SE
Sammamish, WA 98075

Exhibit 29
SSDP2016-00415
002808

January 27, 2017

Lindsay Ozbolt
Associate Planner
Community Development
801 228th Ave SE
Sammamish, Wa 98075
lozbolt@sammamish.us

Attention: Ms. Lindsey Ozbolt

Subject: East Lake Sammamish Trail Segment 2B

Dear Ms. Ozbolt,

The following are our comments and concerns regarding the recently-released 60% plans for the development of the East Lake Sammamish Trail (ESLT) Segment 2B. On January 25th we spent 30 minutes with King County reviewing the 60% Plans for the East Lake Trail. We discovered and discussed a number of issues that we believe need to be addressed before the City issues any permits for work. For reference, our property is located at 2325 East Lake Sammamish PL SE, Sammamish WA 98075; on the recently-released 60% plans we are located at station 328+00. We appreciate your time in compiling these issues and helping to get to a resolution that makes the trail great for everyone.

We ask that members of the City of Sammamish Council, City of Sammamish City Manager and King County officials visit us, walk the trail and see firsthand these challenges. Overall, we believe the current plan will unnecessarily adversely impact our property, remove access to our property and create an unsafe situation for trail users and for our family. However, with some adjustments, and by working together, these challenges can be resolved.

We kindly ask that the City of Sammamish take these comments and questions into consideration. More specifically, we hope that the City and County put the safety of its citizens first, minimize the impact on Sammamish lakeside residents, and reduce the impact on the environment and the existing trees. Our goal is to partner with you, work towards resolution and do our part to ensure that the trail is a great asset for all.

Our concerns with the plans fall into five (5) categories:

- Safety
- Access
- Landscaping, Trees, Water and Run-off
- Rest Stop
- Ownership

Safety

We want the trail plan to be safe for all users, and residents, and feel that the 60% plan does not meet this goal of a safe environment in several areas:

Exhibit 29
SSDP2016-00415
002809

- 1) Currently the plans do not show fencing being replaced along either side of the trail. This is concerning for several reasons.
 - a. First, on the water side, there is a steep drop to the lake and a significant amount of that is comprised of large boulders and rocks. A trail user veering off the trail onto this slope – especially at any significant speed – will be at risk for grave physical harm. What is the rationale in removing the fencing that is there today, and not replacing it? We request that this is addressed by the current fencing, which was installed at the expense of the community homeowners, to remain in place during and after construction, or,
 - b. replacing the fencing on the water side of the trail with fencing comparable to what is in place today including a gate for access.
 - c. Second, there is no fencing replaced on the uphill side of the trail. We have both small children and pets – the current fence keeps them inside the yard safely. It also keeps trail users on the trail and not in our yard. Providing unfettered access onto the trail from our yard, and into our yard from the trail is not safe for our family, or trail users. We request that this is addressed by replacing the fencing on the uphill side of the trail, or we replace it, with fencing comparable to what is in place today including a gate for access.

Access

The construction period for Segment B is listed as 2 years. During the construction period there will be construction fencing erected along the trail. Our home is bisected from our waterfront dock, cabana, deck, beach, etc. by the trail, and our goal is to partner to minimize disruption and access.

- 1) How will we access our waterfront during the construction period?
- 2) Will the construction fencing be up for the entire construction period, along the entire length of Segment B? If so, we request that this be broken into segments to minimize the disruption of waterfront access for all homeowners living within the Segment B section. Being separated from our waterfront docks, cabanas, beaches and boats for this period of time is not acceptable to us.
- 3) We currently have water and electricity running under the existing trail down to our dock and cabana. We wish to preserve these utilities. We request that the county ensures and commits that these utilities will be preserved, between our home and the waterfront during construction and upon completion of the project. We request that the county adds the location of these utilities into the trail development plan and provides assurances that they will continue functioning during construction and afterwards.
- 4) We have concrete stairs that run down to our waterfront on the west side of the trail. The top of these stairs is shown inside the C&G line. What specifically will happen to the top of our stairs during construction? What will happen to them after construction?

Landscaping, Trees, Water and Run-off

Throughout the trail development process many complaints have been lodged with the City of Sammamish and King County regarding the removal of trees, impacting property owners, disregard with code compliances, and many others.

- 1) The current 60% Tree Preservation Plan does not accurately reflect the major trees located on our property, or those neighboring us to the north or south. Currently there are three old-growth Douglas Fir trees displayed in this plan. They are tagged with numbers 8757, 8758, and

Exhibit 29
SSDP2016-00415
002810

8759 as shown on page TP6 of the Tree Preservation Plan. However, there are a significant number of additional old-growth Douglas Fir trees in the immediate vicinity – as close to the proposed trail as the tagged trees in some cases. Why haven't all of these trees – of similar location, size, species and importance to the local neighborhood – been tagged for preservation? We request that every one of these old-growth Douglas Fir trees adjacent to the trail to be tagged and added to the Tree Preservation Plan, and that they are marked to SAVE as noted with the three trees currently listed.

- 2) Our lower yard sometimes floods as water that runs down the hill to the lake is trapped by the interim trail. How does the current draft design address water run-off and potential flooding on the east side of the trail?
- 3) The enlargement and paving of the trail will generate significant additional run-off from the trail surface itself. How does the current draft design address water run-off from the trail surface?
- 4) The current plans show a pipe funneling runoff into the lake (Outfall #2). What is the proposed elevation of this pipe above the surface level of the lake?
- 5) How big is the drainage pipe coming into catch basin 10?
- 6) What is the proposed landscaping that the county will be installing within the C&G line after construction is completed?

Rest Stop

We are highly concerned about the decision to include a rest stop (note 12) in our yard. We have a number of questions, and for several reasons we urge you to consider removing it or moving its location.

- 1) What are the specifics of a Type 1 rest stop? There are no specifics provided in the plans outside of the rough dimensions noted. What is a Type 1 rest stop?
- 2) What are the criteria utilized to determine locations for rest stops on the trail? How did this location meet those criteria? Can this location be moved to elsewhere on this trail segment that is not in a homeowner's backyard?
- 3) Why was this location chosen when there is another larger – Type 2 – rest stop proposed a very short distance up the trail (AL13 note 13). It should be noted that not only is this location very close to the proposed rest stop in our yard, it is also located in a community property location and not an individual's backyard.
- 4) What is the specific plan for the fill noted around the proposed location of the rest stop?
- 5) We are concerned that the lack of fencing shown in the plans will allow trails users free access to our entire backyard as there is no clear delineation between the trail and our yard, making for an unsafe situation for our family. We request that this is addressed by replacing the fencing on the uphill side of the trail, or we replace it, with fencing comparable to what is in place today including a gate for access.
- 6) We are concerned that a rest stop will generate trash and waste that does not get regularly cleaned up, or cleaned up at all, by the County. How will the County address this?
- 7) We are concerned that a rest stop will generate loitering and questionable uses that puts our family, and neighbors, in danger. How will the County address this risk?
- 8) There is a larger rest stop shown in the 60% plans a short distance to the north, in what's locally called the community beach. What is the rationale, and demonstrated need, to have two rest stops installed so close to each other?

- 9) Nowhere else on the 60% plan do we see a rest stop being proposed in someone's back yard. We request that it is removed from our yard, and either moved or eliminated given the proximity to a much larger rest stop shortly up the trail.

Ownership

We understand that the County owns the former railroad right of way through a quit claim it received. Various portions of the right of way have different legal origins, some portions were by grants from private landowners, some portions are based on the railroad's use of the right of way and acquisition of rights by prescriptive easement or adverse possession, and some portions are based on a specific grant by the Federal Government. Our property is in the latter category. While the scope of what the County acquired may be somewhat uncertain, the United States Supreme Court has recently held in *Marvin M. Brandt Revocable Trust v. United States*, 134 S.Ct. 1257 (2014), that federal grants of property to railroads were the granting of easements, and not fee ownership. So, the most that King County could have acquired by a quit claim deed is an easement. Additionally, the federal Surface Transportation Board is only allowing King County to use the railroad corridor for trail purposes and for an interim period of time. These too are the hallmarks of an easement.

Because the County only has an easement in this section of the right of way, we are entitled to use the property in any way that does not interfere with the County's trail easement. It seems like we have the right to keep and should be able to retain all landscaping and water, electricity and access across the trail because none of these interfere with trail use. Nevertheless, we are supportive of the trail as a community asset and may be willing to give up some of these rights if the County makes modifications based on the concerns in this letter. In any event, the City should not allow the County to exceed its property rights in this particular area where there can be no doubt that the most it acquired was an easement, without accommodation to the homeowners.

We ask the City of Sammamish and King County to modify the trail plans to address the above concerns such that the improved trail is a safe undertaking for both residents and trail users. We believe the trail, properly developed, will be a wonderful community asset for everyone; however, updates are needed to accomplish that goal.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments, and we look forward to partnering with you to resolve the concerns we have raised.

Regards,

Nate and Alison Thompson
2325 East Lake Sammamish PL SE
Sammamish, WA 98075

Email:

nate@weareratio.com

alison-thompson@live.com

Cell:

Nate: 206-427-1599

Alison: 206-409-9049

Exhibit 29
SSDP2016-00415
002812

Trail with fence erected by homeowners on water side:



Stairs to Water and fence, both installed by owners:



Exhibit 29
SSDP2016-00415
002814

Old-Growth Douglas Fir Trees With and Without Tags:



View of Backyard area proposed to be developed into Rest Stop:



View of Backyard area proposed to be developed into Rest Stop, note un-tagged Old-Growth Douglas Fir trees:



Exhibit 29
SSDP2016-00415
002817

View of Trail with wood and metal fencing installed by homeowner:



Exhibit 29
SSDP2016-00415
002818

Overview of Trail bisecting neighborhood:



Exhibit 29
SSDP2016-00415
002819

Lindsey Ozbolt

From: Lindsey Ozbolt
Sent: Friday, January 27, 2017 4:16 PM
To: 'Craig'
Subject: RE: Comments/Questions for ELST 60% Design & SSDP

Dear Craig,

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: Craig [mailto:craig.o@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, January 27, 2017 8:01 AM
To: Lindsey Ozbolt <LOzbolt@sammamish.us>
Cc: Lyman Howard <lhoward@sammamish.us>; Don Gerend <dgerend@sammamish.us>; Tom Hornish <THornish@sammamish.us>; Kathleen Huckabay <KHuckabay@sammamish.us>; Bob Keller <BKeller@sammamish.us>; Christie Malchow <CMalchow@sammamish.us>; Tom Odell <todell@sammamish.us>; Ramiro Valderrama-Aramayo <RValderrama-Aramayo@sammamish.us>
Subject: Comments/Questions for ELST 60% Design & SSDP

Ms. Ozbolt,

Attached are our comments and questions for the ELST 60% design and SSDP. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to call us.

COUNCIL MEMBERS & CITY MANAGER: We are copying you on our comments to Ms. Ozbolt in hopes you take the 5-7 minutes to read through our comments. Even if you just scan the document, we have included pictures of our property in our document that I think will provide you a better understanding of how the trail impacts our property and other folks who's property is bisected by the proposed trail.

Finally, my wife Tammy and I want to personally invite Ms. Ozbolt, Mr. Howard and all the Council members and any other people from the City's leadership group to come to our home and see first hand what we are proposing and the impact the trail has on our everyday lives. You can either email or call me (Craig) using the contact information below.

Thank you and hope to hear from you to schedule a day and time for a visit to our home.

Exhibit 29
SSDP2016-00415
002820

Craig & Tammy Owens
1619 E. Lake Sammamish PL SE
Sammamish, WA 98075
206.713.3815
craig.o@comcast.net

Exhibit 29
SSDP2016-00415
002821

ELST Comment & Questions – Sent to Lindsey Ozbolt, Associate Planner via Email:
lozbolt@sammamish.us

Submitted by:
Craig & Tammy Owens
1619 E. Lake Sammamish PL SE
Sammamish, WA 98075

Ref: Impacted Property located at ELST B-Line 357-00

Introduction –

We are providing comments, questions and recommending possible solutions to the issues that we find unacceptable to the ELST / Section 2B 60% Design Plans & SSDP.

All the parcels that abut the trail are impacted and we do not want to diminish their specific concerns or impacts, but our property is “bisected” by the trail and believe that each of the bisected parcels will be disproportionately affected by the construction and use of the trail once opened than any of the other properties up/down the 11-mile trail. Just so understand, we own the property on BOTH sides of the ELST right of way and having an enhanced trail be constructed as designed will only increased public use and decrease our home value. This increase in use and traffic between our home and beach property/dock can be easily seen as being more negatively impacted than a trail that is next to an arterial behind the home (which is the case for most parcels effected by ELST/2B).

We watched the January 10th City Council meeting on TV and would support what the Council is proposing for the most part. What was interesting is that some of the Council members were 1) unaware that the trail bisected lakefront properties and 2) that there is still an ownership dispute in the courts and 3) there are various court decisions that have been decided by the courts in favor of the property owners. Obviously King County isn't forthright in the publication of those decisions and they are not being transparent with the Council.

We will propose throughout our comments below that based on the lack of understanding that some Council members have about where the trail is being routed for the bisected property owners, that an onsite inspection and discussion between the decision-makers from the City of Sammamish and King County and each owner /resident with a bisected parcel be scheduled. We understand that this may be onerous and perhaps not practical, however, having viewed at least some representative parcels could be helpful when it comes to making a knowledgeable decision and grasp of the issues.

Exhibit 29
SSDP2016-00415
002822

Areas of Concern & Questions -

1. Trail Alignment & Width

- a. Will the City/King County shift the trail centerline East at our home if the shift maintains the same centerline as the interim trail and KC Trail Alignment Criteria listed on KC Website?

The following is our proposal to shift the centerline as currently proposed in the 60% Design plans to the existing centerline of the current Interim trail.

- i. Owner's Trail centerline (CL) Shift Proposal-
 1. Located at approximately B-Line 357-75 (moving North), begin a transition easterly to B-Line 357-00 where trail CL will be 4'-0" east of current proposed KC CL.
 2. At B-line 357-00, begin to transition back to existing proposed KC CL located at B-Line 359-00.
 - a. See Photos #1 - #4 below for a visual/graphical view of proposed alignment shift.




Exhibit 29
SSDP2016-00415
002823

Photo #1 - View Looking North




Photo #2 - View Looking South

IMPORTANT: Our proposal is to just shift the KC proposed centerline BACK to the center of the existing Interim Trail.

**Exhibit 29
SSDP2016-00415
002824**



Photo #3 - View Looking South



Photo #4 - View Looking South

IMPORTANT: Our proposal is to just shift the KC proposed centerline BACK to the center of the existing Interim Trail.

- b. Justification for Requesting Trail Re-alignment -
 - i. Current plan by KC/Parametrix is to remove at least two mature (25+ year) Alpine fir trees and assume three other 25+ year trees that are unmarked by Parametrix but within the CG construction area. Shifting the trail provides a very good possibility that all of these five 25+ year mature trees will be saved.
 - ii. If it's possible to save these trees, they provide a visual buffer from the trail to our beach property, patio, dock and swimming area. If not, what is KC/Parametrix doing to replace the privacy screen these trees provide from trail users onto our beach property?

**Exhibit 29
 SSDP2016-00415
 002825**

- iii. Pursuant to the KC published communication on how the trail alignment was established, **our proposal “meets or exceeds” all the criteria listed.**

Specifically;

1. Shifting the trail to the East as we propose will shorten the height of the current proposed structural wall on West side of trail by approximately two feet. Since there is no wall currently required on the East side of trail for approximately 80 feet (40 ft North and South of B-Line 357-00) that is our property, reduction in the height of the East wall is in fact a cost savings.
2. Reducing the wall height on West side of trail decreases the cost of the stair construction to enter our lakeside property.
3. Shifting the trail the four feet we are requesting @ B-Line 357-00 increases the buffer on the wetlands on the West side of trail North and South of our beach property. In addition it still maintains a wetlands buffer in the areas North and South of our property on the East side of the trail to other designated wetlands. Remember, there is a transition of our requested 4 foot shift (@ B-Line 357-00) back down to zero @ B-Line 355-75 & B-Line 359-00 so as you re-align the trail North and South it continues to be closer to the KC proposed CL.

NOTE: If KC/Parametrix wants to transition from B-Line 357-00 “sooner” than what we are proposing, that is acceptable so long as they can save all five 25+ mature trees that provide privacy for our beach property.

- iv. How can I request an on-site meeting (at our house) with persons with authority to discuss our proposed re-alignment?
- v. Does the City know that the AASHTO Guidelines are ONLY guidelines and not an absolute requirement? Why doesn't the City limit the trail width to something close to the existing Interim trail or at a maximum of 14 ft (that is still in accordance to AASHTO Guidelines) in the bisected area of the trail?

2. Owner Access & Utilities Crossing to Property Owner's Beach and Dock

- a. During Construction –
 - i. Will gates be placed in the CG fence so we can access our beach and dock?
 - ii. How will Contractor allow access to our beach and dock during construction prior to permanent stairs/access being installed?
- b. Post Construction/Trail Open – (See Photos #5, #6 & #7 following)
 - i. Beach Access location
 1. I/we have established landscaping with paths and stairs to access our beach property and dock at a specific location and have used this location for the last 25+ years. In the 60% Design plans, it appears KC/Parametric has placed stairs that will be “shared” with our neighbor (to the South) and will require my family and guests to enter the trail from the East at

Exhibit 29
SSDP2016-00415
002826

our current location and then walk 50 feet South on trail to access our beach property.

- a. Is this location on the Plans the final location or just a placeholder?
 - b. Why can't the location of our existing beach steps be maintained?
- c. Stair Design – There isn't a specific stair detail in the 60% Design Plan set but based on graphic detail, it is assumed KC/Parametrix plans on building one double stair set to be shared by two property owners.
- i. The stair type detail might meet the standard rise/run and handrail building codes, but it does not allow me to transport our lawnmower and other lawn maintenance equipment up/down the stairs safely without using two people. I maintain our own property so KC & the City if they approve this design are preventing me from maintaining our property and causes a safety issue for me trying to carry lawn maintenance equipment up/down the stairs as proposed.
 1. Can the stair step design be changed with 3' to 4' runs to accommodate the transportation of lawn equipment up/down stairs and either match the curved design as we currently have or run the stairs East/West/ perpendicular to the trail? If no, provide reasons why these are not alternatives.
 2. See Photo #5 & #6 below and Photo #7 on our current stair location and stair design that allows one person to transport lawn maintenance equipment up/down stair with one person.



Photo #5



Photo #6

Exhibit 29
SSDP2016-00415
002827

ii. "Shared" Stairs with Neighbor –

1. We have used the stair path location and stair design to access our beach property and dock for over 25+ years and argue that KC or the City has no right for us to change. Let alone to the fact that our landscaping from our house and deck include a pathway to our beach property that has been there for the last 25 years. In addition the beach property landscaping and path to access was designed to match the access from our home. Please provide and maintain access to our beach property and dock at the current location. If you cannot, what is/are the justification that stairs are required to be shared by two property owners and that they have to be shifted approximately 50 feet to the South?
2. If the City or KC is unwilling to use our current stair design and location, is there a plan that KC/Parametric will provide a gate at the top of both stairs so our neighbor and my family can lock our respective gates to our beach property? Failure to provide this individual ability KC and the City create a security issue that must be mitigated and changed. (Reason: With one single gate and IF our neighbor forgets to lock our shared gate and then someone enters our property and causes damage/vandalism to our property, KC and the City has caused us to battle who pays for the reimbursement and repair of the vandalism.)

NOTE: See Photo #7 below for visual understanding for all the points, comments and related questions noted above.

d. Utilities Crossing Location & Types

i. Temporary Power & Water during construction –

1. What plans are in place to provide temporary power and water crossing during the construction period for property owners who have utility requirements on the West side of trail?
2. Who do I work with in coordinating how the temporary utilities will be located so I can re-establish our utility hook-ups?

ii. Permanent Power, Water & Sewer Pass-through Access –

1. At what time in the design process will someone contact me to meet on-site to discuss the location of the permanent utilities pass-throughs so they can be incorporated into the Parametric Design plans? (These utilities are required to service our beach and dock property.)
2. If your response is through a Special Use Permit, King County only has a surface right-of-way easement over our property and why would we pay to walk across the trail to access our property but KC doesn't charge trail users. Isn't use the same?

Exhibit 29
SSDP2016-00415
002828

- a. **Why is it alright for a person to park anywhere up/down the East Lake Sammamish trail and/or are an adjacent property owner that “abuts” the trail and enters the trail to use it are NOT charged or required to purchase a special use permit, but KC is requiring property owners that own property that is bisected by the trail and legally owns both sides, have to apply and pay for a crossing fee via a Special Use Permit EVERY 10 years?**

3. Wetland determination –

- a. The Wetlands 21AC on the West side of the trail (@ B-Line 356-00 +/- 35 feet North and South) on our property is not a wetland thus marked incorrectly. What is required to correct this on the plans and if you disagree, who can I meet with to discuss the science and proof they have that it is a wetlands?

4. Clarification on Status of Existing Trees & Landscaping within the Clear/Grub (CG) Area (REF: Tree Preservation Plan TP10)

- a. Current Tree Preservation Plan called for Trees 8018 & 8019 to be removed. Accepting moving the trail centerline to the East (as proposed in Item 1 above) would possibility save or prevent the removal of these trees.
- b. The Coral Maple (South of 8018), Flowering Plum (North of 8019) and Alpine Fir (North of 8019 & flowering plum) are not marked within the CG Area. These trees are basically the same size as Trees 8018 & 8019 so we are wondering.
 - i. Why wasn't the one coniferous tree (Alpine Fir) described in b) above marked or indentified in the Tree Preservation Plan if it has the same trunk size as Tree 8018 & 8019?
 - ii. I understand that the deciduous trees do not meet the “significant” status as defined by King County, but provide significant screening for our beach property from trail users. Are these deciduous trees in b) above planned to be removed during construction?
 1. What can be done to preserve these trees (25+ years old)?
 - a. NOTE: Shifting the trail to the East would ensure these additional trees could be saved and maintain this security and privacy for us from trail users.
- c. See the Photo #7 below that visually explains our comments and questions noted above.




Photo #7

IMPORTANT: Photo #7 is the view from our West-facing deck attached to our home.

- d. Other Photos that help understand the impact to our Beach property and Access



Photo #8

Accepting our proposal to 1) Use the existing Interim trail centerline (vs. recently staked KC centerline), 2) Reduce the trail width in bisected area to 12 to 14 feet that meets all the KC published goals and criteria for trail alignment will save all the trees and supporting shrubs that have been there for 25+ years.



Photo #9

5. What is required to formally request a meeting with us on-site (Owner's location) with Decision-Makers of approving SSDP and managing the ELST?

Specifically we would like to meet with;

- a. City of Sammamish
 - i. Council Members - All
 - ii. Lyman Howard – City Manager, Jeffery Thomas, Bldg Dept Director, Angela Feser - Parks Director
- b. KC Parks and/or Parametrix
 - i. Gina Auld – ELST Capital Project Manager
 - ii. Person(s) responsible for recommending proposed trail alignment and discuss owner's alternative?
 - iii. Person(s) responsible for designating land on our beach property as wetlands (Ref: Wetlands 21AC)?

Thank you

Craig and Tammy Owens
1619 E. Lake Sammamish PL SE
Sammamish, WA 98075
206-713-3815
craig.o@comcast.net

Exhibit 29
SSDP2016-00415
002831

Lindsey Ozbolt

From: Lindsey Ozbolt
Sent: Friday, January 27, 2017 1:58 PM
To: 'Mark J Madgett'
Subject: RE: City of Sammamish

Dear Mark,

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: Mark J Madgett [mailto:Mark_J_Madgett@newyorklife.com]
Sent: Friday, January 27, 2017 7:45 AM
To: Lindsey Ozbolt <LOzbolt@sammamish.us>
Cc: Lizannemadgett <lizlablvr@aol.com>
Subject: City of Sammamish

City of Sammamish
801 228th Ave SE
Sammamish, WA 98075

Att: Lindsey Ozbolt

We are Mark and Lizanne Madgett, and will forever own a home in the Mint Grove community. The address is 1203 E Lk Sammamish Shore Ln SE. We recognize that "forever" is a long time. As Sammamish residents for 19 years we dreamed, planned, worked hard, and saved for what seemed like an eternity, hoping to find the exact right place for us to spend the rest of our lives, and if possible insure that our children and grandchildren would have that same opportunity. The address of this dream come true is 1203 E Lk Sammamish Shore Ln SE. It is in station 372, the landscape plan is on page 124 of 135 trail plan.

We were able to attend the meeting on the 10th of January, and Liz also had a 30 minute session with a representative on the 12th. Both meetings clarified some of our questions with what will occur near our home and neighborhood. However, there are others that have not been addressed. As you are aware Mint Grove has one entrance and exit.

Concerns: (some of these have also been shared by our neighbors in evidence of the broader impact the new trail design is having on our Lane)

Neighborhood Concerns:

-Emergency vehicle access and turn around, and general safety of all neighborhoods residents and their guests

Exhibit 29
SSDP2016-00415
002832

-removal of over 300 trees, and the subsequent impact.

-Areas that are erroneously labeled as wet lands, and the subsequent impact that this designation is having on the safety of our neighborhood.

The space to the East of the trail could accommodate both the widening of the trail, satisfy the safety concerns our our community, retain the flora and fauna that currently reside in synergy with our residents, and provide the needed space to retain the water run off from the plateau.

Our Specific Property Concerns:

-The city explained that the C/G area will reside in an area that we have maintained and landscaped with an irrigation system since we took ownership. Will we be responsible for removal and capping of the system?

-There is also a rock retaining wall (that on the plans looks to remain) that is an integral part of the integrity of our landscaping. The wall extends to the end of our drive and turns east towards the trail approximately 4-5 feet, following the continuous line of the property. This curved section holds our house number (1203) and is lighted. The electrical wiring is imbedded in the stone, and is part of a closed loop that also powers the lights on the remainder of the retaining wall. This small section of our wall looks like it will be demolished, and possibly replaced by something else. Who will be responsible for the fees associated with the electrical work and subsequent restoration of power to the remainder of our lighting system?

-There are multiple below ground drainage systems that feed water from the slope to the street that run under our house and feed into the lake. What are the plans for these? Will they be impacted by the proposed construction? If they will be, who is responsible for the work?

Tree Removal: Tree number 8702

- This tree is a mature and healthy Douglas Fir (estimated to be in excess of 50yrs), and is slated to be removed. The reason given is that it lives in the "Sight Triangle". If you look at the tree's placement it does not block any sight line on the trail or the road. Our home is the only residence to the right of the trail entrance. The tree is on the right hand side of the drive. We can assure you having lived in our property for over 5 years that this beautiful tree is not encumbering the entrance to, or egress from our drive to the street. There is complete visibility to all traffic on the trail while crossing in a vehicle. There are so few of these beautiful specimens left on the East side of the lake shore. The tree is clearly outside of the mandated trail width dimensions from the currently staked centerline. I suspect that the real issue here is the desire to use the C/G area, which the tree resides inside of, as a staging area for construction purposes, and will make the execution of the project inconvenient. Again, if the trail went marginally East instead of West this would not even be an issue, along with the loss of an additional 300 trees. Killing this tree would be a ridiculous solution to accommodate the new and improved version of the trail.

From our perspective, these and all of our neighborhood concerns are common sense issues that rely on the human capacity to make great decisions when alternative options are available. To be clear, we are "trail people", use it everyday, and love the idea of a shared community treasure. I suspect that if the non-resident users of the resource had a say in these important micro decisions, that many, if not most would side with the hard earned wisdom that as a community we advance as a common sense argument for minor remediation of the trail plan. We have a chance to get this right, and model a true government/community partnership in the process.

We would request that the SSDP approval be put on hold until the 90% plans are released, and there is resolution to our concerns.

Thank you for your consideration, and we will look forward to your response.

Lizanne and Mark Madgett

Sent from my iPad

Sent from my iPad

Exhibit 29
SSDP2016-00415
002833

Lindsey Ozbolt

From: Lindsey Ozbolt
Sent: Friday, January 27, 2017 1:43 PM
To: 'Peggy Michael Reddy'
Subject: RE: South Samm B - REDDY.docx

Dear Peggy,

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: Peggy Michael Reddy [mailto:reddy@benefits-consulting.com]
Sent: Friday, January 27, 2017 7:30 AM
To: Lindsey Ozbolt <LOzbolt@sammamish.us>; 'ELST Master Plan' <ELST@kingcounty.gov>
Cc: Peggy Michael Reddy <reddy@benefits-consulting.com>; Karrah Penk (Benefits Consulting Services LLC) <karrah@benefits-consulting.com>
Subject: South Samm B - REDDY.docx

Hi Kelly and Lindsey: Attached as a word document are my comments and questions with regard to the proposed King County trail. I have also attached (again) the boundary adjustment of 1999 and site survey showing the new boundary adjustment. This boundary change is not entirely and accurately reflected in the King County survey of the trail which I understand has been recognized and will be corrected. I will be removing County stakes on my property unless for some reason the County has jurisdiction on private property. I understand that the King County ROW is 25 feet from the centerline of the trail westward toward my property. Thanks for your consideration and time to review concerns, Peggy

Peggy Michael Reddy
929 ELS Shore Lane SE
Sammamish WA 98075
206.484.4845

Exhibit 29
SSDP2016-00415
002834

January 26, 2016

FROM:

Peggy Michael Reddy
929 East Lake Sammamish Shore Lane SE
Sammamish, WA 98075
Phone: 206.484.4845
Tax parcel ID #51970-0075-00, 06246-9013-06

TO:

Kelly Donahue / email: ELST@kingcounty.gov
Community Engagement /King County Department of Natural Resources
1.888.668.4886

Lindsey Ozbolt / email: LOzbolt@sammamish.us
Associate Planner | City of Sammamish | Department of Community Development
425.295.0527

RE: East Lake Sammamish Master Plan Trail South Sammamish Segment B

Reference King County Survey Documents:

- Plan and Profile AL20 Sheet 52 of 135
- Landscape Plan LA12 Sheet 124 of 135
- Tree Preservation Plan TP12 Sheet 12 of 28
- Station Points 376+50, 377+50, 378+50

To Whom It May Concern:

I purchased my Sammamish property at 929 ELS Shore Lane SE in August 1997. I bought a portion of the former Burlington Northern Railroad ROW in 1999 directly from the Land Conservancy who I understand sold the remaining ROW separately to King County. I recognize that King County owns 25 feet from the ROW centerline westward toward my property located approximately 250 feet parallel to the trail corridor. I fully recognize King County's rights and ownership to the ROW for trail use and construction.

I have been fully supportive of the trail and its development by King County. It is a joy for me to use. I'm a former community member of the trail advisory board which was created almost 20 years ago. At that time I demonstrated my advocacy and support of the trail project during those difficult and challenging planning years communicating the future trail plans with the public. I welcomed the future trail and fellow trail-users. Unlike so many adjacent trail homeowners, I created clear views of the ROW and my property, its scenery, the landscaping, and Lake Sammamish to be enjoyed by all trail-users. I did not wall-off my property behind tall skinny trees – the trail corridor is now lined with so many Leyland Cypress, Arborvitae, and Junipers. Rather, I created something beautiful spending an enormous amount of time and money over a 20-year period making the property what it is today for all to enjoy. In addition to my work, former homeowners also planted on the ROW. When I purchased my property, the Aspen and Douglas Fir trees were already there and the some of the mature shrubs which are now well over 20 years old.

Because of my love of the property and what has been accomplished over the last 20 years, I'm deeply disturbed and troubled as to the County's proposed redirection of the existing trail further westward. This would require the complete and utter destruction and devastation of the existing landscaping, mature shrubs, and trees so carefully taken care of and nurtured over so many years. There is an entire habitat existing within the trail ROW and in my own yard. I understand that the County proposes to move the trail westward into the existing landscaping because the U.S. Corps of Engineers has designated Section 23C (a hill on the east side) as "wetland" which I will argue it is definitely not. Please consider the US Environmental Protection definition of "what is a wetland?" as follows:

Exhibit 29
SSDP2016-00415
002835

A Wetland is defined as: "Those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or ground water at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions. Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs, or similar areas."

By this very definition, the hill to the east of the trail is not a wetland. It's simply a hill full of brambles, truly unsightly underbrush choked with noxious weeds. There's a ditch made by King County below the hill that collects water and run-off. That ditch was manmade. We strongly believe that the Corps has not properly categorized the hill. If categorized as "wetland" the consequences will have extreme negative impacts on the existing flora and fauna to the west of the current trail ROW. Further, I would argue that part of the ROW westward where the County proposes to move the trail could, by virtue of the definition above, be deemed a "wetland" as we have ongoing water saturation and water running into the area where the County proposes to move the trail. This definition would surely prohibit the County from moving the trail further west impacting water running onto my property from the ROW. I invite you to come onto both the ROW and onto my property and observe for yourself.


Further even if Section 23C was truly a designated wetland, which I think is not possible, that area simply cannot hold more value as a habitat important for wildlife than the existing area proposed to be cleared of mature landscaping and trees. I would like consideration of an exception if the Corps will not restate the area as not a wetland. Also Section 404 of the Clean Water Act appears to allow for authorization to make exceptions. I am certain exceptions are possible and that this small change to keep the trail either at the current location or moved east not west is both logical and practical. Has an exception to overcome a Corps designated "wetland" been explored by King County or the City of Sammamish?

Please also consider the proposed trail plan would add unnecessary costs to King Count as well as to me! The proposed construction plan would require the removal of ten (10) trees and 6,250 square feet of landscaping requiring excavation and replanting which would be very costly to King County. If the County is willing to reconsider the trail plans and either keep the trail where it is or move it further east rather than west, I'm fully prepared to assist the County by transplanting or removing vegetation that the County deems a safety hazard within its ROW. This would be my preference and the preference of my neighbors and also the preference of so many other trail-users who have enjoyed and openly commented on their appreciation and admiration of the current landscaping which I have maintained on the County ROW.

The picture below is the segment of the trail segment in question (looking south). Keeping the trail in its current location or moving it eastward would mitigate the loss of the current flora and fauna. Otherwise everything seen in this picture and westward including the trees and shrubbery along the fence below would be cleared – including the decades old Aspen and Douglas fir trees – ten in total. This entire section of the ROW would be denuded from the split-rail fence to 25 feet to the west. Nothing would be preserved based on the proposed King County trail plan.



In addition to my concerns about moving the trail westward, the trail plan shows a line where all landscaping of any kind is slated for "Clearing and Grubbing" (C&G) up to that line which I understand is the entire 25 feet west of the current split-rail fence. That act of C&G is so shocking, emotionally disturbing, and impactful that I would appreciate consideration to mitigate the incredible loss of the current trees and shrubbery by moving the C&G line eastward. Removal of every piece of landscaping within the border of the C&G seems unconscionable, wasteful, and expensive. The picture below on the left is looking north and that landscaping you see would be wiped clean under the proposed trail C&G process. The picture below on the right is one of many large mature rhododendrons in the ROW. That would be cut down along with all the others large rhododendrons and azaleas within the County ROW. There are probably at least 25. Some were already located in the ROW when I purchased the property 20 years ago. They would all be cut down, not because the trail would be located in that space but merely because the construction requires "C&G" of everything in its path. All shrubbery and trees to be bulldozed; the landscape to be denuded; everything goes under the proposed trail plan. Absolutely nothing is to be preserved in the ROW under the proposed trail plan.



Under the County's plan all that we see in these pictures above will be gone. The trees and shrubbery cut down and all the landscaping dug up and thrown away. Under the County's plan nothing in these pictures will be preserved or left behind. Under the County's plan the land will be denuded, completely stripped of everything. 25 feet by 250 feet – that's 6,250 square feet laid bare saving only the largest of the Douglas fir trees and cutting down all the rest. I think it ironic that the County has so meticulously laid plans to "preserve" a piece of ROW (Section 23C) that has no value, no beauty, and no habitat because the Corps called out "wetland". Is there no value placed on decades-old trees and shrubbery and the wildlife that lives there in the ROW? To me it is tragic and farcical to pursue denuding the ROW as planned by the County. It is madness to me and I believe it makes no sense whatsoever. I implore to whoever has power at King County or the City of Sammamish to make modifications to the trail plan and reconsider not to move the proposed trail westward. Keep it where it is or move it eastward instead. And please revisit the C&G impact. Why denude? Please save the beautiful habitat inside the ROW for all to enjoy. Thank you!

Below are some of the issues that I raised with Ms. Kelly Donahue at the County on 1/24/17 to discuss the County's trail plans. I have the following concerns and comments:

1. Please provide assurance that the trail survey will be corrected to reflect proper ownership. None of the County trail sheets reflect the correct 1999 boundary line adjustment between my property and the King County ROW. The County stakes are misplaced within my legal property for the tax parcel number shown above. The County owns only 25 feet westward from the trail centerline.
2. I question the integrity of the designation Section 23C (the hill east of the trail) as a "wetland". I would like the Corps to review and designate the Section 23C correctly, not a wetland. Please explain if this is the reason that the trail deliberately jogs westward for only a few feet rather than staying on the current trail position.
3. Please do not move the trail westward. Please keep it at the current location or move it eastward to reduce the impact on existing landscaping enjoyed and appreciated by trail users. By doing so the County can avoid destroying landscaping and habitat. Please also consider this option would be less costly to King County and save tax payers the cost of denuding the ROW section of landscaping and trees designated for removal.
4. Please save trees slated for clear-cutting. The County's "Tree Preservation Plan" shows the removal of ten (10) decades old trees – they are tagged numbers (86)45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54.
5. Please reconsider the location of the Clearing and Grubbing (C&G) line designation especially noting that the area south (Section 376+50 and 377+50) is on a steep embankment on which construction workers cannot possibly navigate or use during construction yet would require C&G. The C&G process is entirely unnecessary on the embankments. What can the County offer to mitigate the C&G destruction method?
6. Whatever decisions made by the County, I suggest saving the existing plants in the ROW if they are removed for C&G purposes and then transplant them back into the ROW. This would reduce waste and lower costs to King County for this trail segment.
7. The proposed 4-foot chain link fence would be unsightly and I am certain would impact property values. I'm happy to have no fence or to pay for the cost difference to have my own more attractive fence approved by King County especially in areas where there are steeper grades (Station Points 375+50 and 377+50). My preference is a fence that trail-users could see through and thereby enjoy the natural habitat.
8. My utilities (gas and water and outdoor electrical) are within and outside the ROW. I am guessing the lines are around 18" from the surface. There is also an electrical unit protruding from the ground in the ROW. Does the County plan to move the service lines and electrical? What plans does the County have to assure continual service during construction? If the County accepts my suggestions above, this becomes a non-issue.
9. The entire ROW and my property include an extensive irrigation system. Will the County dismantle and maintain the system within the ROW and reinstall it to be used upon trail completion or simply destroy it during the construction phase? Will the County install a new irrigation system?
10. What is the timeline for start of the segment of the trail ROW along my property line?
11. Who will be responsible for meeting with me personally at my location to mitigate my concerns? Is the County working with homeowners in this capacity?
12. How are decisions made to mitigate the issues I've raised? Who has the power within the County or City to consider and authorize the above proposed changes to the County's trail plan?
13. Has the County worked with other homeowners to address the above issues during other trail construction and what was the outcome?
14. Are there any pending lawsuits against the County or City that would delay or impact the trail construction? If yes, please briefly explain.

Thank you for taking time to seriously consider decisions that will impact the Sammamish Trail homeowners, especially the trail segment the County wants to move to protect a hill (Section 23C) which can only be described as an eyesore. Please protect and preserve the habitat within the ROW. Thank you!

Regards,
Peggy M. Reddy
206.484.4845

Exhibit 29
SSDP2016-00415
002838

KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON
BOUNDARY
LINE
ADJUSTMENT
NO. 199L3056

DECLARATION

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS THAT WE THE UNDERSIGNED OWNER(S) OF THE LAND HEREIN DESCRIBED DO HEREBY MAKE A BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTMENT THEREOF, PURSUANT TO ROW 58.17.040 AND DECLARE THIS ADJUSTMENT TO BE THE GRAPHIC REPRESENTATION OF THE SAME, AND THAT SAID ADJUSTMENT IS MADE WITH FREE CONSENT, AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE DESIRES OF THE OWNER(S) IN WITNESS WHEREOF WE HAVE SET OUR HANDS AND SEALS.

Name: JAMES J. REDDY
Name: PEGGY M. REDDY

Name: _____
Name: _____

I certify that I know or have satisfactory evidence that _____ signed this instrument and acknowledged it to be his/her free and voluntary act for the uses and purposes mentioned in this instrument.

I certify that I know or have satisfactory evidence that _____ signed this instrument and acknowledged it to be his/her free and voluntary act for the uses and purposes mentioned in this instrument.

Signature of _____
Notary Public
Dated: _____
My appointment expires: _____

APPROVAL

DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL THIS _____ DAY OF _____, 1992

KING COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF ASSESSMENTS
Examined and approved this _____ day of _____, 1992

SCOTT NOBLE
King County Assessor
519-710-2025
RECORDED NO. _____

RECORDER'S CERTIFICATE

filed for record this _____ day of _____, 1992, at the request of NEIL CABBAGE, SURVEYOR'S NAME
b.h. _____ Mgr.
W. H. Cole, Supt. of Records

LAND SURVEYOR'S CERTIFICATE

This BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTMENT correctly represents a survey made by me or under my direction in conformance with state and county statutes in MAY, 1999

Signature: _____
Certificate No. 22845



APPROVAL NOTES:
THIS REQUEST QUALIFIES FOR EXEMPTION UNDER RCW 19.081.10, IT DOES NOT GUARANTEE THAT THE LOTS ARE SUITABLE FOR DEVELOPMENT NOW OR IN THE FUTURE. THE LEGAL TRANSFER OF THE PROPERTY MUST BE DONE BY SEPARATE INSTRUMENT, UNLESS ALL PARCELS ARE UNDER THE SAME OWNERSHIP.

DWN. BY		DATE	JOB NO.
NSC		10/8/99	9820.00
CHKD. BY		SCALE	SHEET
NSC		1"=30'	1 OF 1

LEGEND

- D SET LINE STAKE W/THICK
- X SET PK NAIL
- FOUND REBAR OR PIPE AS NOTED
- (C) CALCULATED VALUE


BASIS OF BEARINGS AND HDA SURVEY: BASED ON FOUND LOT CORNERS SET BY MODWELL & ASSOCIATES, PER SURVEY FOR STEVE GRAVES, DATED 6/24/97, JOB NO. 97115.

LEGAL DESCRIPTION

OLD LOT "A"
THAT PORTION OF TRACTS 15 THROUGH 19, MASON'S LAKESIDE REPLAT, BEARING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED IN VOLUME 37 OF PLATS, PAGE 55, KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON, LYING EASTERLY AND SOUTHERLY OF A LINE DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:
BEGINNING AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF TRACT 19, RUNNING THENCE EASTERLY ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF SAID TRACT, 42.10 FEET TO THE TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING;
THENCE SOUTH 16° 14' 00" WEST 152.70 FEET;
THENCE SOUTH 51° 34' 00" WEST 108.90 FEET TO IRON PIPE ON SHORELINE OF LAKE SAMMAMISH AND ON TRACT LINE BETWEEN TRACTS 14 AND 15, TOGETHER WITH SECOND CLASS SHORELANDS ADJOINING.

OLD LOT "B"
A PORTION OF BURLINGTON NORTHERN AND SANTA FE RAILWAY COMPANY'S (FORMERLY NORTHERN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY) SNOQUALMIE BRANCH LINE RIGHT-OF-WAY BEING 100.00 FEET WIDE OVER AND ACROSS GOVERNMENT LOTS 1, 2, AND 3 AND THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 6, TOWNSHIP 24 NORTH, RANGE 6 EAST, W. M.; LESS PORTION THEREOF IN SAID GOVERNMENT LOT 3 AS DEEDED TO PATRICK AND VICKI BURNS UNDER RECORDING NUMBER 9701221277 AND TOGETHER WITH THAT PORTION OF SAID RAILWAY COMPANY'S 200 FOOT WIDE BRANCH LINE RIGHT-OF-WAY OVER AND ACROSS GOVERNMENT LOT 4 IN SAID SECTION 6; LESS PORTION DEEDED FROM NORTHERN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY TO ALEX KOLL UNDER RECORDING NUMBER 2402400, WASHINGTON ALL IN KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON

CITY OF SAMMAMISH APPROVALS
APPROVED THIS 35th DAY OF October 1999
City Engineer



999 1101 9000 3