



## Department of Community Development

801 228th Ave. SE, Sammamish, WA. 98075 Phone: 4252950500 Fax: 4252950600 Web:  
[www.sammamish.us](http://www.sammamish.us)

April 12, 2017

King County Dept. of Natural Resources and Parks  
Attn: Gina Auld  
201 South Jackson Street, Suite 700  
Seattle, WA 98104-3855  
[gina.auld@kingcounty.gov](mailto:gina.auld@kingcounty.gov)

### *Hand Delivered*

RE: East Lake Sammamish Trail Segment 2B SSDP2016-00415 – First review and request for additional information

Dear Ms. Auld,

This letter is to provide you initial comments, a request for additional information, and a status update on your project, East Lake Sammamish Trail Segment 2B (SSDP2016-00415). As you are aware, this proposal was subject to a 30-day public comment period that ended on January 27, 2017 and generated hundreds of public comments. The public comments were transmitted via CD along with a comment summary matrix to King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks on March 22, 2017, which you picked up from Sammamish City Hall.

The City of Sammamish has reviewed the information submitted by King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks on October 19, 2016 and November 30, 2016. Additionally, City staff have reviewed all public and agency comments received. Please respond to and/or address each comment received, either through direct response to the comment, or by indicating how the issue(s) raised by the commenter has been addressed in the project plans. Similarly, if you contend the comment is outside of the scope of the SSDP permit review, please indicate why you believe that is the case. Below is a summary of comments received:

#### I. **Summary of Comments Received:**

##### A. Critical Areas:

- 1 • Concern over construction within a wetland buffer and/or stream buffer and how it will be protected
- 2 • Jurisdictional ditch #11 should be an underground ditch, it's a hazard
- 3 • Wetland 23C near station 378 should be evaluated by USACE and reconsidered
- 4 • Wetlands 23A & 23B, and jurisdictional ditch #14 are artificially created and do not require a buffer
- 5 • Re-evaluate Wetland 18C

- 6 • Wetland 28A and unnamed Stream #28 are incorrect
- 7 • Creating unnecessary wetland buffer areas
- 8 • Trail should slope to allow water to access wetlands
- 9 • Concern of wetland elimination

B. Wildlife Habitat:

- 1 • Concern for existing wildlife
- 2 • Chain link fencing will prevent wildlife crossings
- 3 • Were bald eagles and osprey considered
- 4 • Drainage/dispersion areas should be on the east side of trail only

C. Survey:

- 1 • Incorrect property boundaries staked in multiple locations along trail
- 2 • Plan set does not show newly constructed residences or garages
- 3 • Houses/garages shown partially or entirely within staked ROW, how will they be affected

D. ROW/Ownership:

- 1 • Dispute with County ownership of ROW and survey boundaries
- 2 • Railroad only had prescriptive easement, underlying ownership is private
- 3 • Pechman ruling is under appeal

E. Stormwater/drainage:

- 1 • Concern over increased runoff, hard surfaces, and pollutants
- 2 • Keep storm piping sizing consistent and do not create unnecessary backup of water or flooding
- 3 • How will underground drainage systems be addressed
- 4 • When existing drainage exists on east side of trail, why create new drainage area on west side of trail
- 5 • County should work with City to address increased stormwater needs now and into the future; especially in Inglewood and Tamarack area
- 6 • Broken culverts exist under rail bed: unnamed streams #4 and #5
- 7 • Improve additional “creeks” for fish passage

F. Access:

- 1 • Creation of steeper driveways will not allow emergency vehicles and other large vehicles/trailers access to homes
- 2 • Concern emergency vehicles and other large vehicles/trailers will not be able to access residences
- 3 • Not aware of the County combining or eliminating driveways in the completed segments of trail to the north and south; explain why being done in this segment
- 4 • ADA access needs to be provided to both trail users and residents
- 5 • Provide assurances that access will be available to homes during construction and that driveways will not be damaged
- 6 • Provide designs for staircases to be changed/replaced
- 7 • How will mailboxes and parking areas be accessed if stairs that are shown as remove are not replaced along East Lake Sammamish Parkway
- 8 • How were the shared stair access scenarios determined
- 9 • Explain how access will be provided for residents during trail construction
- 10 • Acknowledge deeded easement for the Tamarack community beach access
- 11 • More public access points to the trail are needed; only three (3) currently exist for this segment.

G. Construction/Staging Area:

- 1 • Where will equipment be stored during construction
- 2 • Construction of trail should be completed in two phases for this segment to minimize

- property owner disruption
- 3 • Need written approval from all property owners to use private driveways/roads for construction access

H. Parking:

- 1 • Re-design rockeries/walls to allow for more resident parking
- 2 • Concern over removal of existing residential parking, both shared and individual areas – will there be a net loss in residential parking

I. Clearing and Grubbing Limits:

- 1 • Clearing and grubbing limits are not designated for a portion of this plan set
- 2 • How will structures be protected during construction when clearing and grubbing limits abut a structure
- 3 • Reduce width of clearing and grubbing limits

J. Trail Width/Location:

- 1 • Explain reasoning for proposed trail alignment
- 2 • Trail should not be improved outside existing footprint
- 3 • Use existing trail centerline for alignment as it reduces need for some additional retaining walls and lowers construction costs
- 4 • Do not move trail to the west, many trees and wetlands can be avoided if trail is not moved west
- 5 • Use 10 foot width for trail as AASHTO recommends

K. Structures:

- 1 • Will existing structures located in clearing and grubbing limits be removed
- 2 • Provide more details on proposed “rest stops”

L. Safety:

- 1 • County needs to protect homeowners from liability created from trail
- 2 • Who is patrolling trail, enforcing cyclist speed limit and preventing trespassing on private property
- 3 • Trail improvements will increase risk to home owners of vandalism, theft and trespass
- 4 • Will homeowners be allowed to install security gates that align with the chain link fence installed by the County
- 5 • Will homeowners be allowed to install their own fencing in place of or behind County’s proposed chain link fence
- 6 • Install signage to keep cyclists off of private driveways
- 7 • Proposed 4 foot high fence does not prohibit unauthorized access to each side of trail
- 8 • Replace existing fences upon construction completion
- 9 • Trail design should include measures to reduce speed of cyclists
- 10 • Paint a centerline on trail
- 11 • Hydrants need to remain accessible at all times
- 12 • Concerned with integrity of hillside once construction begins
- 13 • How will icy conditions on the trail be addressed, specifically black ice

M. Trees:

- 1 • What is the plan for tree retention and minimal tree damage during construction
- 2 • Narrow trail to retain trees and shrubs where able
- 3 • Many healthy, significant, and old growth trees proposed to be removed and should be retained
- 4 • Shift trail appropriately to retain healthy significant trees throughout segment

N. Landscaping/Aesthetics:

- 1 • Will homeowners be allowed to plant new/replace landscaping after trail complete
- 2 • Replace chain link fence with split rail fence, which exists on other completed portions of

- the trail
- 3 • Use rockeries instead of concrete walls
- 4 • Use concrete treatment on concrete walls similar to other segments
- O. Signage:
  - 1 • Need to designate what is private property
- P. Utilities:
  - 1 • Locate and do not disturb existing water/sewer/power/telephone/cable etc. utilities already existing under and/or above ground
  - 2 • Update plan set to show all existing utilities/infrastructure
- Q. Privacy:
  - 1 • Will locking gates be added to staircases to maintain privacy
  - 2 • Replace landscaping for privacy and noise reduction

**Staff Review and Comments:**

Please review and respond to the attached comments (attached in the form of a letter or memo to the file) from City of Sammamish Public Works Department, the East Side Fire and Rescue District, and Sammamish Plateau Water and Sewer District. Each issue/item identified within these letters/memos must be addressed. They have been included in the format submitted by the reviewer to ensure the technical content is retained. Similarly, the City of Sammamish Department of Community Development and the City of Sammamish Parks & Recreation Department have the provided comments which are incorporated directly into this letter for your response. In addition to responding to each issue/item included in the attached discipline review letters, please also respond directly to each issue/item listed below.

II. Department of Community Development – Lindsey Ozbolt, Associate Planner, P: 425.295.0527, E: [lozbolt@sammamish.us](mailto:lozbolt@sammamish.us)

A. Trail Design:

Staff has reviewed all application materials, public comments, and walked the site. Based on the current landscape of the area and the fact that this project is located within the Shoreline Jurisdiction of Lake Sammamish, it is important to address how the clearing and grubbing activity is limited so as to minimize the adverse impacts on the ecological functions and values of Lake Sammamish as discussed in the policies of the City’s Shoreline Master Program (SMP).

- 1 • A majority of the proposed trail facility is located within the City of Sammamish Shoreline Jurisdiction as established by the City of Sammamish Shoreline Master Program (SMP) under Title 25 of the City of Sammamish Municipal Code (SMC). The proposed trail facility also crosses through numerous sensitive landscape features (stream and wetlands and associated buffers) that qualify as Environmentally Critical Areas under SMC 21.50. Under guidance established by City of Sammamish Comprehensive Plan policies, both Shoreline Jurisdiction resources and Environmentally Critical Areas resources are regulated with the purpose of avoiding, minimizing, and mitigating impacts from development and land uses by requiring permit applicants and project designers to consider and apply mitigation sequencing to their projects. While the application materials provided with the application for Shoreline Substantial Development Permit (SSDP) in support of the proposed trail facility do appropriately (with some required revisions/corrections – see below) identify sensitive features, such as shoreline resources, streams, wetlands, trees, and existing vegetation, the application does not include an adequate description of how the project complies with the requirement that Mitigation Sequencing be considered and applied during project design. For example, what design

## II. A.

considerations and accommodations were made to avoid and minimize impacts to shoreline resources, streams, wetlands, trees, and existing vegetation? Please provide a mitigation sequencing compliance narrative that addresses each instance where the proposed trail facility intersects with a shoreline resource, stream, or wetland and also considers trees, and existing vegetation and describes what the design objectives were and what alternatives were considered. The narrative must clearly demonstrate in each of these instances why avoidance was not possible. The narrative must also clearly demonstrate how, when avoidance was not possible, impacts were minimized through design and how appropriate mitigation is provided.

- 2 • Consistent with the comment above, and consistent with SMC 21A.30.210(3) and 25.06.020(5), please provide further explanation and documentation as to how the proposed width of the clearing and grading limits is the minimum necessary consistent with the standards and requirements in the SMC. Please provide this in the form of a design considerations narrative that describes project objectives and how the proposed clearing and grading limits are the minimum necessary given the project objectives/requirements. Please indicate in the required narrative how the proposed design and clearing and grading limits are consistent with the findings of the project EIS as well as the standards and requirements of the SMP, SMC, and AASHTO guidelines along with what design flexibilities were considered in meeting these code requirements.
- 3 • The AASHTO recommended minimum paved width for a two-directional shared-use path is 10 feet. Please evaluate this trail segment (2B) with the consideration of reducing the width from 12 feet to 10 feet for longer segments or in specific locations where applicable to address public concerns and to meet the shoreline and critical areas mitigation sequencing requirements described above. Please include a summary of this evaluation in the required mitigation sequencing narrative described above and update the plan set as necessary where narrowing of the trail is necessary for compliance with mitigation sequencing.
- 4 • AASHTO also allows for a reduction to eight (8) feet of paved trail width for short distances when physical constraints cannot be sufficiently mitigated. Please evaluate this trail segment (2B) with the consideration of reducing trail width to eight (8) feet where applicable to address concerns regarding constraints and to meet shoreline and critical areas mitigation sequencing requirements described above. Please include a summary of this evaluation in the required mitigation sequencing narrative described above and update the plan set as necessary where narrowing of the trail is necessary for compliance with mitigation sequencing.
- 5 • In areas where fences or retaining walls will exist in conjunction with environmental or design constraints, AASHTO allows for a minimum of one (1) foot clearance instead of three (3) feet (two foot shoulder and one foot clear zone). Please evaluate this trail segment (2B) with the consideration of reducing the clearance to one (1) foot where applicable to address concerns regarding constraints and to meet shoreline and critical areas mitigation sequencing requirements described above. Please include a summary of this evaluation in the required mitigation sequencing narrative described above and update the plan set as necessary where narrowing of the trail is necessary for compliance with mitigation sequencing.
- 6 • In addition to narrowing the trail where possible as described above, please also consider the use of yellow centerline striping to indicate where bicyclist passing is permitted. The use of a solid yellow line indicates where passing is not allowed and broken yellow lines indicate where passing is allowed. This may allow for narrowing of the trail in specific areas while still meeting trail design safety objectives. Please include analysis regarding use of this safety feature and if it is infeasible explain why in the required mitigation



## II. A.

sequencing narrative described above and update the plan set as necessary where narrowing of the trail is necessary for compliance with mitigation sequencing. If use of this safety feature is feasible, it should help facilitate narrowing the trail as described above and will help demonstrate compliance with the mitigation sequencing requirements.

- 7 • Please provide updated trail use projections that were used in assumptions supporting design.
- 8 • Please provide a narrative describing how trail use projections have changed from projections made in the project EIS.

## II. B. Shoreline Jurisdiction:

In multiple locations (approximate stations 328+00 to 335+00, 340+00 to 344+00, 351+00, 357+00, 374+00, 456+00, & 465+00) of Segment 2B, the existing interim trail and proposed expanded permanent trail is located within the 50 foot shoreline setback.

- 1 • Please provide written justification as to how the proposed plan complies with SMC 25.06.020(9) and “Table 25.06.020: Lake Sammamish Shoreline Setback Reductions.” Alternatively explain how there is no feasible alternative to avoid development within the 50 foot shoreline setback consistent with SMC 25.07.90 and 25.07.100. Please provide a mitigation sequencing compliance narrative that addresses each instance where the proposed trail facility intersects with a required shoreline setback and describe what the design objectives were and what alternatives were considered. The narrative must clearly demonstrate in each of these instances why avoidance was not possible. The narrative must also clearly demonstrate how, when avoidance was not possible, impacts were minimized through design and how appropriate mitigation is provided. The narrative must also describe how the proposed design is compliant with the code citations referenced in this paragraph.

## II. C. Critical Areas and Wildlife Habitat:

The Watershed Company, on behalf of the City, reviewed the Critical Areas Study (CAS) submitted in October of 2016 and conducted site visits in February 2017 for field verification. Based on this review and the requirements of Sammamish Municipal Code please update the CAS and plan set as necessary after re-evaluating the following:

- 1 • Critical Area designations & Classifications:
  - a ○ Review and address the field observations and associated recommendation in Table 1 of the Watershed Company Environmental Peer Review Report dated March 22, 2017 (“Watershed Report”) and attached to this letter. Each issue/item identified within this letter/memo must be addressed. The letter/memo has been included in the format submitted by the reviewer to ensure the technical content is retained.
  - b ○ Update the CAS to include and/or clarify jurisdictional ditch methodology used and update findings and plans as necessary where considering jurisdictional ditches to be wetlands. The status of these features as wetland or ditch may impact trail design where an incorrect wetland determination has been made for a jurisdictional ditch that has influenced trail alignment and design. If features are found to be considered jurisdictional ditches as opposed to wetlands, please adjust trail alignment and design accordingly.
  - c ○ Review and report on the wetland rating category discrepancies identified in Table 2 of the Watershed Report.
  - d ○ Review the ratings of Wetlands 22E and 28D with respect to the very small wetlands guidance (Ecology Publication 04-06-025).
  - e ○ Review Stream 12 for potential typing (currently piped).

## II. C.

- f ○ Add pileated woodpecker to the Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas sections of the CAS and include required design modifications to account for protection of pileated woodpecker habitat.
- 2 • FEIS Review:
  - a ○ Update the CAS to be consistent with the EIS and include a summary of mitigation commitments and potential additional mitigation measures for fisheries, wetlands and vegetation, and wildlife.
  - b ○ Provide an explanation for each mitigation commitment and potential additional measure regarding how it is addressed in the proposed impacts and mitigation planning.
  - c ○ Demonstrate consistency with the EIS.
- 3 • Mitigation Approach:
  - a ○ Update the CAS for consistency with FEIS conclusions.
    - i ▪ Update the mitigation sequencing section of the CAS with a more thorough avoidance, minimization, and compensatory mitigation analysis that is reflective of FEIS conclusions. See comments above under Trail Design.
    - ii ▪ Avoidance: The submittal needs to address design strategies not covered in the CAS specifically the use of a board walk, curving of the trail, and narrower trail segments. See comments above under Trail Design.
    - iii ▪ Minimization: Additional minimization must be considered, such as “necking-down” or narrowing trail segments. See comments above under Trail Design.
    - iv ▪ Compensatory Mitigation: the submittal needs to address offsite compensatory mitigation options, such as the King County Mitigation Reserves Program (“MRP”), in the CAS. As concluded in the FEIS (Volume I, Section 3.3.7), mitigation banking would yield greater ecological value for this linear project. Mitigation is proposed at 21 sites along the 3.5 mile trail segment. Review and revise or support the proposed mitigation design. Include rationale for why mitigation banking or use of the King County MRP are not appropriate. Provide a detailed assessment documenting how the proposed mitigation will maintain critical area functions and values. See comments above under Trail Design.
  - b ○ Review and revise proposed buffer addition areas for consistency with Sammamish Municipal Code. Buffer addition areas must be continuous with a wetland or stream.
  - c ○ Permanent wetland impacts need to be distinguished from temporary wetland impacts on the critical areas impact figures plan set. Currently, this is unclear.
  - d ○ Bald eagle nest protections require USFWS consultation and more detailed mitigation planning.
  - e ○ The mitigation plan notes (sheet LA23) do not match the CAS report text. This must be updated accordingly.
  - f ○ Performance Standard recommendations (CAS Section 5.4.2):
    - i ▪ Wetlands: 1) A plant species diversity standard for trees, shrubs, and groundcover is recommended. 2) The survival, diversity, and cover standards must indicate whether native volunteers are counted.
    - ii ▪ Streams: 1) Habitat elements need to be quantified and mapped on the landscape plan or as-built to facilitate quantitative monitoring. 2) Provide an explanation for limiting performance monitoring for this standard to only three years as proposed.
    - iii ▪ Buffers/Setbacks: A plant species diversity standard for trees, shrubs, and groundcover is recommended.
    - iv ▪ Invasive Species: 1) Provide a justification for the proposed 20 percent invasive plant cover standard; typically a 10 percent standard is applied on most City projects. 2) Recommend making an allowance for higher cover in existing reed

canarygrass monocultures as long as plant driplines are maintained.

- v ■ Wildlife Habitat: 1) Issue a standard to ensure conifer trees are established between the trail and the bald eagle nest near SE 8<sup>th</sup> Street. 2) Set a quantifiable standard for habitat features.

- g ○ Provide a more detailed description of the contingency measures the County will implement if wetland creation and/or other proposed mitigation areas are unsuccessful.

4 • Shoreline Regulations:

- a ○ To better demonstrate consistency with the City's SMP, the CAS must include more specific information about how impacts on shoreline ecological functions are avoided and minimized. See comments above under Trail Design.
- b ○ The CAS must articulate how no net loss of shoreline ecological functions is achieved for other areas within shoreline jurisdiction, but outside of the shoreline setback, that provide shoreline ecological functions. To assist with this, all features contributing to shoreline ecological functions in the project area must be identified. Depictions of project critical area impacts must include a line indicating the landward extent of shoreline jurisdiction. Project impacts to features that may affect shoreline ecological functions must be identified on impact maps.
- c ○ The CAS must address how the proposed mitigation for impacts to shoreline features will ensure no net loss of shoreline ecological functions.

D Trees:

Trees are an important resource within the City of Sammamish. The County provided tree preservation plan sheets in October of 2016 and has tagged trees within the project area as observed by City Staff on a site visit conducted in early April 2017, however an Arborist Report has not been provided as required by SMC. Although SMC 21A.37.230(b) allows for an exemption from City approval when removing significant trees in public rights-of-way, written assessment performed by a qualified professional for the removal and retention of trees and other landscaping needs to be provided consistent with the SMP and SMC.

- 1 • Pursuant to SMC 21A.37.230 a Certified Arborist shall prepare a written evaluation. The written evaluation or report shall include all trees and landscaping; indicate which significant trees are to be saved, monitored, and removed pursuant to SMC 21A.37 and SMC 25.06, and provide a replanting plan. Please provide an Arborists Report compliant with these code sections.

E Maintenance:

Numerous comments were provided from the public regarding maintenance of the trail and associated facilities. Upon completion of Staff's review of the application materials, it is not clear that maintenance of the trail or associated facilities has been addressed.

- 1 • Provide information regarding the anticipated maintenance schedule for the trail and associated facilities pursuant to SMC 21A.30.220.

F Ownership:

Numerous comments were provided from the public regarding ownership. Although the County provided sufficient information to the City regarding ownership it would be beneficial if a written narrative that is easy to understand to the layperson and less technical were provided in addition to the information already received.

- 1 • Please provide a narrative regarding the history and current ownership of the Trail ROW as it relates to the real property include in this proposal. Please work with a public



relations professional to ensure the narrative, which should tell the story behind the establishment of the rail corridor, the abandonment of the rail use, the rail-banking, the conversion to an interim trail, and the development of the current proposed trail, is understandable by the average community member. This narrative will be very helpful in clarifying the ownership questions that have been raised through public comment.

III. Parks & Recreation Department: - Angie Feser, Parks & Recreation Director, P: 425.295.0580, E: [afeser@sammamish.us](mailto:afeser@sammamish.us)

- A • Driveways, road transitions, public access points:
  - 1 ○ Engineering review of driveway and road transitions should occur. The trail cross slope in general is being reduced, and this has led to driveway transition issues for some properties on the north segment.
  - 2 ○ Designate appropriate and adequate public access points to avoid public usage of private driveways. It is not currently designated on the plan set where the public access points will be located. Citizens should be able to review and comment on these locations. Adequate signage should also be provided.
- B • Coordination with city non-motorized planning:
  - 1 ○ The City's adopted Trails, Bikeways and Paths Plan has several planned non-motorized routes running east-west with connections to the East Lake Sammamish Parkway. These are in the vicinity of SE 24th Street, SE 8th Street and SE 32nd Street. Public access points should be designated with consideration given to these routes to facilitate connection to the ELST.
- C • The City is also beginning work on two plans updating non-motorized planning in the City.
  - 1 An update of the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan is currently in process with an estimated completion in March 2018. A Transportation Master Plan is proposed to begin Spring 2017 and is anticipated to take 2 years to reach adoption. Both of these plans will incorporate non-motorized transportation. Additional coordination may be possible, depending upon trail schedule with these City plans.
- D • Visual screening:
  - 1 ○ Where vegetation removal is unavoidable, it is recommended that replanting be provided where possible to reduce visual impacts for neighboring residences.

Public Works Department: - Haim Strasbourger, Development Review Engineer, P: 425.295.0562, E: [rstrasbourger@sammamish.us](mailto:rstrasbourger@sammamish.us)

Please see the attached Public Works Memo dated March 27, 2017 and marked up plan sheet. Each issue/item identified within this letter/memo must be addressed.

East Side Fire and Rescue: - Jeff Werre, Assistant Fire Marshal, P: 425.313.3324, E: [jwerre@ESF-R.org](mailto:jwerre@ESF-R.org)

Please see the attached memorandum from Eastside Fire and Rescue dated March 29, 2017. Each issue/item identified within this letter/memo must be addressed.

Sammamish Plateau Water: - Kyle Wong, Engineering Manager, P: 425.392.6256, E: [kyle.wong@spwater.org](mailto:kyle.wong@spwater.org)

Please see the attached letter and marked up plan set from Sammamish Plateau Water dated January 27, 2017. Each issue/item identified within this letter/memo must be addressed.

**Project Status:**

The City of Sammamish is notifying you that this application is considered pending until the above described items have been addressed and/or more information is provided to the City as required. Pursuant to SMC 20.05 .100(1) - Permit issuance. City Staff has a target of 120 days from the date an application is deemed complete to the time a decision is made, in this case because it is a Type 4 Land Use Permit, the City Staff will be making a Staff Recommendation to the Hearing Examiner. In the event that City Staff is unable to meet this target time limit, SMC 20.05.100(4) dictates that the applicant shall be provided written notice that includes a statement as to why the target time limits have not been met and an estimated date for issuance of the Staff Recommendation and Hearing Examiner Decision. The formal notice is attached to this letter. Reasons as to why Staff is unable to meet the target 120 day time limit are as follows:

1. East Lake Sammamish Trail Segment 2B Shoreline Substantial Development Permit (SSDP2016-00415) is a complex proposal requiring City Staff to utilize specialized City Consultants to provide adequate technical review;
2. This is a high profile project within the City of Sammamish that has generated a high volume of public involvement through public comment, phone calls, and in person conversation;
3. This application process has changed from a Type 2 to a Type 4 process due to approval of Ordinance O2016-410 and final approval by the Department of Ecology of the changes to the City's Shoreline Master Program; and
4. At least one more staff review is anticipated with a potential additional information request to the County prior to issuance of a Staff Recommendation and setting of a hearing date before the City's Hearing Examiner.

Staff anticipates processing of this application will proceed as follows:

1. Once the County responds to this first review letter, Staff anticipates the need for 30 days to review the County's response and provide additional review letters if necessary. It is anticipated that each subsequent City review will take up to 30 days;
2. Upon completion of final City review, it is anticipated that it will take up to 30 days to draft and issue a Staff Recommendation to Hearing Examiner and issue Notice of Public Hearing; and
3. Public Hearing will begin no less than 14 days after the issuance of Staff Recommendation and Notice of Public Hearing.
4. It is anticipated that a decision will be made by the Hearing Examiner in Fall or Winter 2017.

Pursuant to SMC 20.05.100(4), written notice explaining the status of the target 120 day time limit and project status will be provided to the public within 14 days of this letter.

**Re-submittal Date:**

The City is authorized to set a reasonable deadline for the submittal of corrections, studies, or other information when requested pursuant to SMC 20.05.100. **Therefore, please submit the requested information within 90 days, which is no later than close of business on July 11, 2017.** Failure to meet the deadline may be the basis for the City to cancel the application due to inactivity. An extension of the deadline may be granted upon submittal, by the applicant, of a written request providing satisfactory justification of an extension.

**Intake Appointment Required:**

A formal re-submittal is required. Revisions, corrections, or studies prepared in response to this letter must be submitted in-person as one consolidated/bundled package and will not be accepted by mail, courier, or email. An intake appointment is **required** for submittal of all requested information and may be applied for here: <http://www.sammamish.us/permits-regulations/permits-inspections/intake-appointment-request/>. Please provide four (4) paper copies (unless a different number of paper copies is



specifically referenced) and one (1) electronic version of all information submitted during the intake appointment. Information **will not** be accepted if submitted any other way than through an intake appointment.

If you have any questions regarding the information presented in this letter or regarding review of the project proposal, please contact me at 425.295.0527 or by email at [lozbolt@sammamish.us](mailto:lozbolt@sammamish.us).

Sincerely,



Lindsey Ozbolt  
Associate Planner  
Community Development Department  
City of Sammamish  
425-295-0527  
[lozbolt@sammamish.us](mailto:lozbolt@sammamish.us)

Enclosures: (all provided on CD only)

- Public Comments
- Public Comments matrix
- Agency Comments
- Staff Comments
- The Watershed Company – Segment 2B – Environmental Peer Review Report, dated March 22, 2017
- Notice of 120 Day Clock Exceedance for Shoreline Substantial Development Permit (SSDP) East Lake Sammamish Segment 2B – SSDP2016-00415.
- Status of East Lake Sammamish Trail Inglewood Hill Parking Lot Shoreline Substantial Development Permit (SSDP2016-00415), dated April 12, 2017

cc:

Jeff Thomas, Community Development Director	<i>via email</i>
David Pyle, Community Development Deputy Director	<i>via email</i>
Steve Leniszewski, Public Works Director	<i>via email</i>
Haim Strasbourger, Development Review Engineer	<i>via email</i>
Tawni Dalziel, Public Works Senior Stormwater Program Manager	<i>via email</i>
David Linehan, Kenyon Disend, PLLC	<i>via email</i>
Kim Pratt, Kenyon Disend, PLLC	<i>via email</i>
Frank Overton, King County Parks Capital Project Managing Supervisor	<i>via email</i>
Jenny Bailey, Parametrix Project File	<i>via email</i>