

Debbie Beadle

From: Reid Brockway <waterat@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, June 28, 2012 7:29 AM
To: ECA
Subject: Fwd: Questions on ECA process

EXHIBIT NO. 152

Dear Commissioners,

The communication below, which contains four questions about the ECA update process, was sent to you in advance of the June 14 PC meeting. A couple of these questions received some discussion during my testimony, but not complete answers, and there was no opportunity for further discussion of them due to the Open House portion of that meeting not occurring.

Perhaps it is your intention to address these in today's meeting. I respectfully request that you do, as it is of considerable interest to me and to others of the public who have submitted ECA recommendations. If that is not possible, I request that the public be given a commitment as to when answers will be provided. In our view these elements are key to a successful public process.

Thank you.

Reid Brockway

----- Original Message -----

Subject: Questions on ECA process
Date: Wed, 13 Jun 2012 13:41:37 -0700
From: Reid Brockway <waterat@comcast.net>
To: eca@ci.sammamish.wa.us

Dear Commissioners,

The following concerns the ECA update process, and is offered for your consideration in advance of the June 14 meeting. I will mention this in testimony and will try to discuss it with as many of you as I can during the Open House phase. But it would be greatly appreciated if the matter could be addressed during the formal part of the meeting so that all council members and others in attendance can have benefit of the discussion.

Here is the issue. Staff has indicated that they will be doing some work pertaining to some of the public recommendations, which presumably will result in some additional input to the Commission beyond what is in the public testimony. The following is a representative example, as appears in a Staff Recommendation Memo. (More or less the same thing is said about several of the recommendations.)

Additional staff analysis and research will be conducted on the following:

- a. How the proposed amendment would be supported by Best Available Science.
- b. Ease of use for city and applicants.
- c. How to ensure consistency between applications and over time, and adequate record keeping.
- d. Identifying the policy basis for the amendment.

In addition, it is implied that Staff will be producing draft text for the code changes, presumably as input to the July 12th or 26th meetings.

It is possible – maybe even likely – that those who proposed the amendments will not agree entirely with Staff’s conclusions and drafts. And there may be some misunderstandings leading to Staff recommendations that are not faithful to the proposers’ intent.

This raises a few questions:

1. When will this information be presented to the PC, and will the public have a chance to review and comment on it in advance of the deliberations to which it is input?
2. Will the PC revisit the testimony that introduced the amendment, or will the staff’s much-abbreviated versions plus input as above be the sole basis for the deliberations?
3. Will there be an opportunity for dialogue between the PC and the party who offered the amendment to provide clarification and work out any bugs?
4. Will the PC accept alternate draft text from the public for those amendments that made the cut?

If at all possible, these questions should be answered before issues arise associated with this aspect of the process. If those answers could be provided at tomorrow's meeting, that would be excellent.

One of the basic tenets of the GMA update process for critical area reviews is that it is to be a **public** process. The public should be allowed to work with the Commission and Staff to arrive, if possible, at a mutually acceptable end product that goes to the City Council. I am prepared to do that as it pertains to my recommendations and wish to have that opportunity.

Thank you.

Reid Brockway