

City of Sammamish Town Center Sub-area Plan Summary of SEPA EIS Scoping Comments

In accordance with the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), scoping for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on the Sammamish Town Center Sub-area Plan was conducted from March 17th, 2006 to April 12, 2006. A public open house and scoping meeting was held on March 28, 2006.

The public scoping meeting consisted of an open house with city staff and project consultants presenting information to citizens at three stations. The first station contained information about the existing built and natural environment within and around the proposed Town Center. The second, presented preliminary sketches of possible Town Center layouts meant to elicit comments. At the third station, attendees were asked to participate in a visual preference survey where numbers indicating preferences were assigned to various building types.

Open house attendees were asked to fill out a form at each station. The forms at the environmental station and the sketches station asked for written comments, while the form at the visual preference station was a survey asking participants their opinion (as indicated on a 1 to 5 scale) on a number of design scenarios. Because the visual preference survey results did not include written comments, they were not incorporated into this scoping summary.

Public comments were also received through online forms accessible to the public through the City of Sammamish website, as well as emails and letters sent directly to City staff. An email received from Public Health of Seattle & King County was the only government agency comment submitted.

All comments received during the scoping period were reviewed for SEPA EIS issues. Comments that were not related to alternatives, environmental impacts, or mitigation were not included as EIS scoping comments, but will be considered with other aspects of the Town Center planning process. The City received a total of 60 comment forms, emails, and letters containing approximately 201 comments. Table 1 below shows the number of comments received during the scoping period based on format.

Table 1. Number of Comments Received During Comment Period

Comment Type	Number of Comment Forms, Emails, and Letters	Number of comments
Open House Forms - Environmental	10	30
Open House Forms - Sketches	23	-
Sketch 1	-	32
Sketch 2	-	26
Sketch 3	-	24
General Comments on sketch forms	-	4
Open House Comments on Post-it notes	2	8
City Website - Vision Comment Form	9	22
City Website - Sketches Comment Form	4	10
Email Communication with City	2	6
Letter Communication with City	8	35
Agency Comment - Public Health - Seattle & King County	1	4
Totals	60	201

The comments covered a broad array of topics. Most of the comments indicated general environmental concerns. The most common concerns were related to protection of streams and wetlands, runoff and water quality, traffic congestion, and the proposed mix of land uses in the Town Center area. Several comments stated geographic specific concerns. Examples of these included concerns about operations of a particular intersection, water quality in a particular stream, or conditions within a specific property. All of the comments were categorized into one of ten categories. Table 2 below shows the number of comments in each of the ten categories.

Table 2. Number of Comments within topic categories

Comment Subject Summary	Number
Earth	2
Water	13
Streams, Wetlands, Fish and Wildlife	41
Land Use	36
Aesthetics/Views	16
Transportation	60
Public Health	3
Public Services	19
Alternatives	5
Mitigation	6
Total	201

All of the scoping comments will be used to help determine the issues that will be analyzed in the EIS. Table 3 is a summary of all comments received. The table also indicates in which section of the Draft EIS discussion on the topic could be found.

Table 3. Summary of Scoping Comments

EIS Section	Scoping Comment Summary
Earth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts of topography on development potential in Town Center
Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts of runoff on water quality in Town Center streams and downstream in Lake Sammamish Concern about pollutants & water quality in Town Center streams (with special attention paid to George Davis Creek status on 303d list) Concern about stormwater drainage problems (flooding and erosion) Suggest other documents to review: East Sammamish Community Plan Update and Area Zoning (1992) and East Lake Sammamish Basin and Non-point action Plan (1994)
Streams, Wetlands, Fish and Wildlife	<p><i>Critical Areas</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern over accuracy of critical areas maps Concern for sizes of critical areas buffers Impacts of development activities within and around critical areas buffers

EIS Section	Scoping Comment Summary
<p>Streams, Wetlands, Fish and Wildlife (continued)</p>	<p><u>Vegetation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question about potential cause of tree mortality (runoff?) • Impacts of plan on existing tree and vegetation cover <p><u>Streams and wetlands</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that wetland and stream buffers are too small • Impacts of development on streams, wetlands and their buffers • Concern for streams on east side of 228th • Concern over accuracy of critical areas map (identifies hydraulic retention pond - man made in the 1970s - parcel # 124110-0027-04 and 124110-0025-06; unmapped wetlands in northwest portion of the TC; and N of East Side of Eastside Catholic HS (LWSD property) is "very wet compared to farther north (south of Main) • Question about what wetland are classified as <p><u>Wildlife</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on wildlife movement in Town Center (particularly deer) • Possible presence of kokanee, sockeye and chum in Ebright Creek • Impacts of noise and light on wildlife with in Town Center wetlands • Impacts of Town Center plan on existing habitats and forested areas
<p>Land Use</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that Town Center housing and building density is too high • Concern that Town Center will not have sufficient mixed use development • Concern about land use pattern (compatibility of commercial and residential) • Questions about Town Center Plan including office space? • Concern about transition from high density in Town Center to SFR immediately outside Town Center • Concerns that their will be too much mixed use and not enough retail • Concerned that Town Center will not have sufficient residential units • Concerned that Town Center will not have enough affordable housing • Concerned about location of affordable housing (should locate in existing commercial areas) • Question whether Town Center Plan will include provisions for low impact development techniques
<p>Aesthetics/Views</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that the scale of buildings will be too large • Concerned about impacts to view corridors • Concern about the appearance of new development
<p>Transportation</p>	<p><u>Bicycle and pedestrian connections</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question about pedestrian connections to East Lake Sammamish Trail, and other City areas • Bike connections to regional bike system <p><u>Traffic/congestion</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on congestion along 228th and 222 SE, and at intersection of 228th and 4th and SE 8th and 228th SE • Impacts of Town Center plan on area congestion • Impacts of Town Center plan on existing road network • Concern about cumulative impacts on area traffic from development and area high schools • Impacts on traffic safety for high school students

EIS Section	Scoping Comment Summary
<p>Transportation (continued)</p>	<p><u>Street network</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about ingress and egress from Town Center • Concern about access to and for public service providers (police, fire and emergency services) • Is Main Street access to new neighborhood duplicative of Eastside Catholic entrance (access to neighborhood?) • Concern that there will be insufficient access to retail • Question about what will happen to SE 8th west of 228th • Insufficient circulation west of 228 except on SE 4th • Concern that retail area does not have multi-direction access • Concern about layout of street network south of 4th (grid vs. meander) • Access to west side of 228th on 4th is too steep and dangerous with no egress to the west except "circuitous" route from 212th • Main Street doesn't go through to connect on the east side of 228th • Question about how Town Center would connect to 212th SE • Question about possibility of road connection between SE 4th and Main Street west of 228th • Question about sufficient connections between Town Center and regional transportation systems (Metro and Sound Transit) • Question about north/south traffic flow west of 228th • Concern for traffic counts, LOS ratings for East Lake Sammamish Parkway, Issaquah-Pine Lake Road, SE 4th, 218th Ave SE between 4th and SE 8th, SE 8th from 218 to 212th, the entire length of 212th Ave N and south to ELSP. <p><u>Parking</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will parking be provided for development in Town Center • How will Town Center incorporate parking and regional transit
<p>Public Health</p>	<p><u>Air and Sound</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts of noise (construction and operation) • Impacts to air quality (particularly for high school students)
<p>Public Services</p>	<p><u>Public Services</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts of Town Center plan on schools • Impacts of Town Center plan on fire protection services • Impacts of Town Center plan on police • Impacts of Town Center plan on libraries • Requirements for additional public services including police, fire, schools, sports facilities and park space <p><u>Parks/Open Space</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about ball fields in Town Center (too many/too few) • Concern that amount of park space, open space, and open green space is insufficient • Impacts of development on commons trails

EIS Section	Scoping Comment Summary
<p>Alternatives</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned that sketches do not reflect vision of SSA Task Force • Desire to see more distinct alternatives • Alternatives should include a range (i.e. low to high) of population densities and building intensities in the Town Center Sub-area
<p>Mitigation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern for mitigation of impacts on water quality in downstream surface waters • Conduct pre-project soils and ground water testing (avoid what happened to the City Hall?) • Stream and wetland monitoring as mitigation • Phase development and monitor as development progresses • Concern that surface water issues are not adequately addressed through use of the KC Surface Water Design Manual

DRAFT