

## Debbie Beadle

---

**From:** Melonie Anderson  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 21, 2013 9:54 AM  
**To:** Evan Maxim; Debbie Beadle  
**Subject:** FW: comments on Pilot Project - please reconsider  
**Attachments:** LL old fence vs elevated trail1.jpg; LL old fence vs elevated trail3.jpg; LL wetland expanded footprint2.jpg; LL2 backed up drain.jpg; LL2 retention ponds.jpg

**From:** Scale Auto [mailto:order1@scaleauto.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, May 20, 2013 6:37 PM  
**To:** Melonie Anderson  
**Subject:** comments on Pilot Project - please reconsider

**EXHIBIT NO.** CC75.

Re: Pilot Project in NO DISTURBANCE AREAS

I HAVE BIG CONCERNS I WOULD LIKE TO HAVE ON RECORD, please.

WE ASSUME PILOT PROJECTS REQUIRE INSURANCE AND ACCURATE DOCUMENTS TO MEASURE CURRENT UNDEVELOPED CONDITIONS WITH EVENTUAL CONDITIONS AFTER THE PROJECT HAS GONE FORWARD. WHO PAYS FOR THIS? Insurance requires accurate documentation of existing conditions in order to prove liability. What provisions are in our budget (paid by tax payers!) to pay for these studies?? and What provisions in our budget (paid by tax payers) pays for Liability Insurance?

(What provisions will be in place to protect us down the road when the true impact of projected low impact development evolves)? How can the pilot projects that use protective applications *currently* thought to be technically advanced in preventing adverse negative impact be monitored and maintained years later when the developers have long gone and property owners have changed hands and pressure continues to whittle away at regulations for personal gain?

I worry "Pilot Project" is just a name for a scary, lop-sided and risky investment that usually benefit a very few. ~ a cop out for developers and home owners to avoid compliance to reasonable regulations that have been put in place for the greater good (especially in the sensitive areas).

For those of you who are familiar with a team effort I was part of to curb the ambitious plans of the Lama Landing development can see today how the foot print of the natural wetlands (which is really a gigantic, glorified retention pond) has increased almost 40% larger than the projected 100 year mark used in outdated studies to defend the developer's original plans. Obviously the outcome resulted in much higher impact than predicted AND that is even AFTER that whole development was reduced substantially in size (mostly due to our team's challenge). How many times has the city had to replace and expand the fence and elevate the submersed trail in the last 5 years? And again, who pays for that long after the developer is gone and the property owners have changed hands...?? The affects of the pilot projects don't really show up for years and by then it is irreversible. *(please see photos of Lama Landing attachment)*

We continue to be victimized by the unscrupulous (and common) practice of contractors sneaking in under the radar, coming in over night and clear cutting small plots of undeveloped lots (or infill) sandwiched between homes in old neighborhoods often without a proper grading permit (skipping part or all of the permitting process) and then claiming ignorance. I was fighting that back when we were Unincorporated Redmond - King County and I (perhaps naively) hoped we had greater protection and control now that we were a city with a local government of concerned and sensitive leaders. It appears we have inherited and embraced, largely unchanged, a systemically dysfunctional system since revenue generated from permit expenses and tax on fallen timber make up a portion of the City's paychecks! This is a seemingly direct conflict of interest and disingenuous incentive for environmental protection measures. (see Clear Cutting attachment in second e-mail)

WHAT IS OUR RECOURSE IF / WHEN OUR ECO SYSTEM HAS BEEN COMPROMISED (despite reassurance otherwise)? The current penalties used to enforce compliance to permit conditions (especially to protect the forested and sensitive slopes areas) are so inconsequential as to be totally ineffective. Until the incentive to to be in compliance **outweighs** the advantages of ignoring them and paying reparations in the rears, we will continue to be victimized by the offenders. [Scrape, pillage, reap the immediate rewards and vacate, leaving those that live here to pick up the pieces, bandaged and bruised and pay through taxes] The damage is so often irreparable and the penalties and attempts at reparation so laughable that it becomes an enabling tool for unscrupulous developers and property owners alike. [AND it gives a bad name to those who go to great lengths to comply with the regulations.] SOMETHING HAS TO BE DONE TO MAKE THE MEAGER ENABLING CONSEQUENCES IN PLACE TODAY BE A MUCH MORE DETRIMENTAL, DISSUASIVE AND DIFFICULT OPTION TO CHOSE OVER CONCURRENCY! (THAT IS THE **ONLY** WAY TO BUILD IN AND ENFORCE COMPLIANCE)

On behalf of the large majority of residence of Sammamish who choose to live here amidst Mother Nature's gifted paradise, I must ask that the counsel members, and the city officials think long and hard about jeopardizing our eco-system and consider the vulnerability the city creates for itself and community when they remove or relax restrictions put in place to protect the integrity of our precious environment and the riches and lure of our natural resources. The pressures and responsibilities you take on as pioneers of our community are many and require making some very difficult decisions. As a gentle and respectful reminder I would like to point out you were elected to act in the best interest of the general community and protect us from slanted regulations that accommodate the personal agenda and gain of a few property owners.

Thank you for your consideration and the opportunity to speak freely. I appreciate the time and dedication you commit to our Sammamish community and trust you to vote in good conscience and with the best intentions in mind.

Nicky Beedle,









