

Debbie Beadle

From: Aaron Holzer <aaronholzer@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 1, 2013 10:39 AM
To: ECA
Cc: samrev@isspress.com
Subject: Risk with no reward - Pilot programs with no clear benefits

After reading the article in the Sammamish Review this week on potential changes to the ECA regulations, it's clear that Tom Vance seems to be asking the right questions; why the city was even considering the pilot program. In driving around the city it feels as though every week a different piece of pristine land is being clear cut for condos or houses, packed in like sardines in a can. Changing the regulations would benefit a few landowners who have had to live with these regulations since the 1980's, but would have absolutely no tangible benefit to the city.

In performing risk assessments, typically there is a benefit at one end of the equation and quite frankly the only obvious beneficiaries are the folks who own the land or would develop the land. Increased tax base is not a factor since while it is true that more houses would add to the tax base as Mr. Vance points out there are other places houses could be built.

Besides the fiduciary responsibility bourn by the Council, they must also be good stewards of the community and the environment. Spending any time considering this proposal seems a waste of time and resources that could better be applied elsewhere. Approving pilot programs should warrant an investigation into who is actually benefitting from a change in a long-standing regulation.



Aaron S. Holzer | +1 425-677-7387 | Mobile: +1 508-450-4192 | aaronholzer@gmail.com

EXHIBIT NO. CC41A