

## Debbie Beadle

---

**From:** dbraabe@comcast.net  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 08, 2012 1:38 PM  
**To:** Debbie Beadle  
**Subject:** testimony for planning commissioners for ECA Public Hearing

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Mike Collins  
Mahbubul Islam  
Ryan Kohlmann  
Joe Lipinsky  
Michael Luxenberg  
Kathy Richardson  
Jeff Wasserman

Planning Commission,

Hopefully, I will be there tonight to present this testimony but my husband is currently in surgery at Seattle Virginia Mason so I may not make it.

First, I want to give my heartfelt thanks to all of you for the time and energy you have put into the process to update the ECA. And, Kathy, I have been most impressed with the way you have conducted the meetings with fairness and focus.

I also want to thank all of you for the time and energy it took to go on your field trip to view some of the critical areas to help you with your decision making.

We all can agree that Sammamish is a beautiful, special place and we all want to preserve that beauty for the benefit of those who live here. In doing that we need to balance individual's property rights with safeguards in the law that protect sensitive areas, preserve wildlife habitats and prevent catastrophic slide and flood events. To do that, everyone will have to make sacrifices for the good of the whole. If I cannot use 1/3 of my property because it borders a type F stream, then I am willing to do that for the sake of the environment and property owners downstream from me. I am deeply concerned that the 'Pilot Program' allowing development in the no-disturbance area that was presented at the October 18th meeting flies in the face of common sacrifice. I feel the City Planners should not be meeting with individual property owners to work out solutions that are against regulations for their piece of property. Whatever is in the regulations should be followed to the letter even if some of us have to give up property rights as a result. As you go forward with your deliberations, I ask that you think about what we want to preserve and not be persuaded by threat of litigation by those who consider application of sensible environmental protection regulations a 'taking' of their land.

Barbara Raabe

EXHIBIT NO. 242

Here is what we are thinking about including in protecting ditches from erosion and damage:

Require level 3 flow control with onsite detention that would allow for variable storm water release at a rate that would not stress a ditch. It is the most stringent standard applied in the KC Design Manual. Monahan, the general area we are currently in only requires a level 2 flow control.

Incorporate some Low Impact Development Techniques to minimize stormwater volumes. Some of the LID Techniques we are exploring are limiting impervious coverage to less than that currently allowed under current zoning and requiring a minimum dedicated open space. Additionally, raingarden(s) and vegetated filter(s) will be required to be incorporated into the design.

We would also suggest limiting the maximum project size of this option to 5 acres for the pilot program.

Please do keep in mind that this is for a pilot program and pilot programs are not typically designed to test only overly cautious project types that are sure to work, as are identified in the currently proposed pilot program, but also projects that are very likely to work, as we will be proposing.

Hopefully this update has whetted your appetite for our draft proposal and code language. We will provide it shortly and have our expert at the next meeting to explain it in detail.

EXHIBIT NO. 243