

Debbie Beadle

From: Kamuron Gurol
Sent: Friday, March 15, 2013 9:30 AM
To: Evan Maxim; Susan Cezar; Kathy Curry
Cc: Debbie Beadle
Subject: FW: CC - ECA Adoption Review Discussion
Attachments: Response to AMEC.doc

EXHIBIT NO. CC 19.

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

From: George Toskey [mailto:getoskey@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, March 15, 2013 9:02 AM
To: Kamuron Gurol
Subject: Re: CC - ECA Adoption Review Discussion

Kamuron,

Attached is the Word version of the document that I gave you yesterday. It shows colors and highlighting not clear in the paper version.

At the beginning of the document is my original statement with the paragraph in yellow being the one with which I was taking exception.

Beginning with "*Response from AMEC:*" the bold text repeats my points from above, the normal text is the response from AMEC (or staff), and the CAPITALIZED RED text represents my feelings about the response.

I only gave this to you as an example of how many of us felt that we were ignored.

Regards,
George

On Thu, 2013-03-14 at 16:13 +0000, Kamuron Gurol wrote:

Room change only

Discuss the City Council Review/Adoption of the ECA Process.

Reid,

Please forward this meeting invite to those of whom you feel would be relevant to attend this meeting.

Matrix Public Comment #72 on April 19, 2012 by George Toskey

Response to AMEC response lacking BAS

“Further, the reports contain generalized statements like the following that exaggerate the impact of the Sammamish ECA regulations. This statement is about Lake Sammamish.

'The lake's surface water temperature, nutrient and pollutant loading, and sediment and organic debris inputs are all affected by Sammamish's regulations protecting wetlands, streams, and riparian buffers.'

Firstly, the surface water temperature is overwhelmingly controlled by the temperature of the air and the heat from the sun. The temperature of the water from Sammamish streams has no measurable impact on the surface temperature of Lake Sammamish.

Secondly, how does building a house on one's property near a stream cause nutrient and pollutant loading? What is the source of the nutrients and pollutants? A structure actually blocks phosphorous and other nutrients in the soil from reaching the wetlands and streams.

Thirdly, are buffers the best solution for keeping sediment and organic debris from entering wetlands and streams and eventually Lake Sammamish? Wouldn't bank stabilization techniques between a house and a stream provide better protection? Buffers offer nothing to control the spread of sediment and organic debris; they are just there.”

Response from AMEC:

Where is the response affecting the Lake's surface water temperature?

THERE IS NO RESPONSE BECAUSE THE CLAIM IS FALSE!!!

What are the sources for nutrient and pollutant loading when building a house near a stream?

Pollutant sources associated with building a house near a stream can be categorized by the phase of the project.

During construction, disturbing the soil can release sediment and nutrients such as phosphorous that are naturally found in soils. The Lake Sammamish watershed is somewhat unique in that there are naturally high levels of phosphorus in the soils – this was an important consideration that was accounted for when King County developed the Lake Sammamish Water Quality Management Plan in the 1990s. Construction activities also have the potential to release chemicals and pollutants associated with building materials and equipment, such as oil, grease, fuel, hydraulic fluids, antifreeze, metals from building materials, wood preservative, cleaning agents and surfactants.

August 7, 2012

Following construction, the sources of pollutants in stormwater runoff from a residence can be building materials such as roofs and gutters that leach metals, landscaping materials and activities, pet and animal wastes, fertilizers, pesticides, sand and salts applied to walks and drives, fallout from pressure washing and sanding, dirt from equipment and vehicles, dirt and grit that washes off of impervious surfaces (roofs, driveways, sidewalks, and roads), plant debris, yard and food waste, and improperly stored materials such as paints and fuels. Vehicle maintenance and power landscape equipment has the potential to release oils, grease, antifreeze, and other materials, while in general these devices can release metals from tires and brakes, and through the exhaust. Car washing has the potential to release oils, grease, sediment, and surfactants. Homes with septic systems also have the potential to release nutrients and bacteria.

THIS IS NOT BAS, BUT MERELY LISTS OF THE MOST POLLUTING AGENTS AMEC COULD IMAGINE. DURING CONSTRUCTION SILT FENCES ARE REQUIRED. AFTER CONSTRUCTION THE POLLUTATING AGENTS BORDER ON REDICULOUS; ROOFS POLLUTE, PETS WILL STAY OUT OF BUFFERS, PEOPLE WILL POUR DANGEROUS CHEMICALS ON THEIR PROPERTY, ETC.

WHY CAN I CONSTRUCT A HOUSE WITHIN 20 FEET OF LAKE SAMMAMISH, A CHINOOK SALMON BEARING LAKE, YET BE REQUIRED TO BUILD 50 FEET FROM A SEASONAL STREAM???

Are buffers the best option; could bank stabilization provide better protections?

THIS WAS NOT THE CLAIM MADE BY AMEC (SEE ABOVE) AND DOES NOT ADDRESS MY COMMENT. PLEASE NOTICE HOW AMEC CHANGES MY COMMENT FROM BANK STABILIZATION TO USE OF A BULKHEAD; DOES AMEC HAVE NO SHAME?

In brief, buffers are the best known way to protect habitat value of both streams and wetlands. Bank stabilization is typically used to minimize erosion, and to protect existing/proposed developments. If natural bank stabilization is used (LWD, vegetation, etc. as opposed to a bulkhead), bank stabilization may be beneficial for the resource (typically a stream). Natural bank stabilization could potentially protect or improve habitat function, especially if it is used in combination with buffers. Buffers are definitely the preferred option for improving habitat function.

George Toskey
2430 238th PI NE

August 7, 2012