

From: [jan](#)
To: [EIS](#)
Cc: [City Council](#); [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: RE: Draft EIS Comment
Date: Monday, September 27, 2021 3:55:30 PM
Attachments: [BLUMA EIS public comment 092721.docx](#)

[CAUTION - EXTERNAL EMAIL]

I have sent my comments electronically via the jot form but also sending them this way as well.

Thanks for considering my comments.

Jan Bird

Please be aware that email communications with members of the City Council, City Commissioners, or City staff are public records and are subject to disclosure upon request.

To the City of Sammamish,

I don't agree with the current Balanced Land Use and Mobility Analysis (BLUMA) EIS scope as it focuses solely on traffic concurrency. This Environmental Impact Study (EIS) will be used to drive changes to the comprehensive plan and land use policy which will have significant impacts on the lives of every resident of Sammamish.

There appears to be a significant lack of transparency during this process which is unacceptable.

- The majority of EIS scoping comments submitted in July of 2020 were not considered or added to the scope.
- There has been no public deliberation by Planning Commission or City Council about the BLUMA EIS scope.
- There have been no public hearings held on the BLUMA EIS. See [WAC 197-11-535](#).

By only focusing on traffic concurrency it does not address issues of internal housing imbalances in Sammamish over the cycle of life, nor appropriate local services and sustainability. And because there have been no study sessions or public hearings, the average person has no clue about what it is and its impact on them.

I ask that the city

1. have study sessions on BLUMA EIS first, then Planning Commission public hearings, then City Council public hearings.
2. redirect the focus of all DEIS alternatives away from concurrency level of service and switch to alleviating housing imbalances in the city.

Once we figure out the internal housing needs, then we need to study the consequences of past comprehensive plans with minimized growth vs. the BLUMA EIS of very low growth, vs.

Optimized Growth. What are the consequences of the three growth possibilities on the resident's needs?

As a senior resident, I don't see that the city has a plan for a variety of housing seniors need as they age. My Sammamish split level home will not work down the road. I don't believe the "we can't be all things to all people" mantra that I hear. Why when I need to downsize or require some assistance that I don't have options like a smaller, one story home close to the grocery or drug store? Why don't I have the option of a senior apt. with light housekeeping and meals? Why don't I have the option of assisted living where I can have my own apt. and assistance with bathing or medication management? If all you look at is traffic concurrency as your focus, you can create policies that won't allow these options to be available.

Let's start with your resident's needs and work from there.

Thank you.