

Buffers - "La Solution du Jour pour Tout"

The buffer widths recommended by the consultants in the Best Available Science (BAS) reports are not supported by the scientific method. The scientific method identifies problems and then proposes and tests solutions to the problems. What we see in the BAS reports is an Internet search of papers suggesting buffers as being a solution for protection of streams and wetlands. The reports do not suggest that buffers are the best solution and do not identify what the buffers protect the stream and wetlands from.

Specifically, how can the City justify the huge discrepancy between the environmental regulations protecting Lake Sammamish and the current and proposed buffers protecting streams and wetlands? Lake Sammamish contains threatened Chinook salmon. The buffer requirement to prevent contaminant inflow and provide food and leafy material for the threatened salmon is less than 20 feet. Further, the standard for protection of Lake Sammamish is "no net loss" of ecological function. This standard required by the Shoreline Management Act is more stringent than the "best available science" mandate of the Growth Management Act.

Material has been submitted to you about the decline of the environment in our streams. This material should be taken seriously. Steps need to be taken to improve our streams. The source of the contamination needs to be identified and then steps taken to eliminate the contamination. The imposition of buffer widths via regulations does nothing to improve the quality of our streams.

What regulations would help protect streams and wetlands? Here are some examples:

1. When a septic system is required for a single-family residence, it should be located such that the structure separates the septic system from the stream or wetland.
2. Minimum buffers of 20 feet or less should be required to restrict naturally occurring phosphorous from entering streams.
3. Catch basins with filters should be required to capture pollutants on driveways within 50 feet of a stream or wetland.

George Toskey

2430 238th PI NE
Sammamish, WA 98074

EXHIBIT NO.

~~110~~

Environmentally Critical Areas COMMENT FORM

Name:	BOB SPRENGER
Address/Email:	22001 N.E. 2ND ST bob@mccphersonconstruction.com
Topic	ECA BUFFERS.
Comment:	<p>IT IS COMMON SENSE THAT THE FURTHER WE STAY AWAY FROM ECA'S, THE LESS IMPACT WE HAVE ON THESE FEATURES.</p> <p>THE QUESTION THAT <u>MUST</u> BE ASKED IS: IN ORDER TO DEVELOP WITHIN (10 FEET?) OF AN ECA, WHAT DOES THE DEVELOPER NEED TO DO TO AVOID ADVERSELY AFFECTING THE ECA?</p> <p>TO SIMPLY SAY "STAY AWAY" IS AN INSULT AND OFFRONT TO OUR CITIZENS. THERE MUST BE SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY TO BE USED TO ALLOW PROPER USE OF ONE'S PROPERTY.</p>
Do you have any suggestions for improvements to the meetings?	

Date:

EXHIBIT NO. 111

Ilene Stahl and Mark McGill
21553 SE 28th Lane
Sammamish, WA 98075

We have lived on the Sammamish Plateau since 1983 and have seen many changes to our environment. As a matter of fact, citizens voted to become a city to have some control over the unprecedented growth we saw here in the eighties and nineties. We have been involved in the public processes that formed our city, the comprehensive plan and the 2005 Critical Areas Ordinance. In these public processes the city always seeks to balance opposing sides of an issue. This sounds like a common sense approach. However, we feel that, with regard to protections for our environment, this is neither rational nor a stance the city should take for the following reasons;

- 1) By the time we became a city, much of our environment and wildlife had already suffered significant impacts. Many streams that historically had sustained runs of native Kokanee Salmon were lost due to urbanization, and virtually all of the wetlands across the Plateau were degraded by deforestation, filling, drainage, agriculture and removal of buffers. We need to make up for this loss.
- 2) We need to increase protections to compensate for the fact that the regulations applied so far have been inadequate. Science has been telling us for years that our regulations have not been strict enough to protect our sensitive areas and we must increase protections if we hope to have them in the future. Yet we have already compromised the regulations. For example, in 2005, we sacrificed two very special wetland overlays for our Town Center. These overlays protected the wetland systems at the headwaters of Ebright Creek and George Davis Creek. We will not know the repercussions of these actions for many years.
- 3.) Our environmental resources are limited. We have a set number of lakes, streams and wetlands and they are encroached upon more every year. On the other hand, urbanization continues to grow, putting more pressure on these limited resources.
- 4) The plateau environment is unique and cannot be compared to other jurisdictions. We have unique geology and hydrology which can trigger landslides, harm private property and endanger lives. Being conservative in protecting the environment here is warranted and wise because as we all know, nature is unpredictable and can throw a surprise or two our way at any time.

EXHIBIT NO.

112.

Environmentally Critical Areas COMMENT FORM

Page 2

Name:	BOB SORENSEN
Address/Email:	
Topic	ECA BUFFERS
Comment:	<p>WHAT ARE VIABLE <u>OPTIONS</u> TO BUFFERS FOR PROTECTING OUR ECA'S.</p> <p>EXHIBIT NO. <u>113.</u></p>
Do you have any suggestions for improvements to the meetings?	

Date: