

Summary of Testimony on Streams and Process

EXHIBIT NO. 221

Date (2012)	Subject	Significance
Feb. 16	Citizens For Sammamish offering of goals for each of the Known Topics	Citizen effort to guide policy in ECA update process in interest of fairness and balance
March 15	ECA consultant products	Critique of initial reports produced by AMEC, pointing out their lack of specificity as to science and legal bases
April 5	Tally of quantitative requirements in ECA code (tabulation of 89 such)	Many seemingly arbitrary "magic numbers" in the code. Encourages city to determine the BAS, legal citations, and peer jurisdiction comparisons for these.
April 5	Administrative issues relating to ECA code	Identifies three issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need for an ombudsman function - Inconsistency in grandfathering provisions - Presence of "red tape" requirements
April 19	Significant issues with ECA code related to streams	Identifies six major problems with the current code and its administration and discusses each. Includes appendix assessing grandfathering provisions.
April 19	Charts: "Observations on Code Associated with Streams"	Presentation on the two main problems with the current stream regulations, providing examples, and offering solutions
April 20	Email to Gurol and eca regarding April 19 testimony	Provides citations to code basis for elements in citizen/staff dialogue dramatization
May 3	Recommended solutions for ECA issues related to streams	Proposes solutions to each of the six major problems identified in April 19 testimony
May 8	Testimony to joint meeting of PC and CC regarding Known Topics list	Makes a case for fixing the inequities that exist in the code today, not leaving them to burden our citizens for years to come. Promotes buffer delineation as an attractive work-around solution.
May 17	Verbal testimony questioning status of two of the six stream-related issues	Reminder to PC that grandfathering and ombudsman issues need follow-thru even tho they did not make the Major list
June 14	Verbal testimony and two charts with questions about process	Given statement in Staff memo that Staff will be researching and assessing the Major amendments, asks four questions about public's role going forward
July 16	Response to PC request for feedback on Evaluation Forms and	Recommends changes to evaluation forms and that a structured approach be devised

	major/minor item list (Brockway email)	for capturing relevant factors for Minor items as well
Sept. 6	Critique of content of evaluation forms for amendments 2-10, 2-11 & 2-12	Identifies general problems with Staff's versions of these evaluation forms
Sept. 13	List of watercourses flowing into Lake Sammamish within city limits (provided to Staff)	Contains numerous examples of small drainages representative of the problem posed by large buffers on all Type F streams
Sept. 16	Mark-ups of evaluation forms for amendments 2-10 and 2-12	Alternatives to Staff's versions
Sept. 18	21A.15.1240 definition of "stream"	Reference material for PC use in considering stream related amendments
Sept. 18	Overview of restrictions associated with streams	Reference material for PC use in considering stream related amendments
Sept. 20	Mark-up of evaluation form for amendment 2-11	Alternative to Staff's version