

March 22, 2001

**OFFICE OF THE HEARING EXAMINER
KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON**

850 Union Bank of California Building
900 Fourth Avenue
Seattle, Washington 98164
Telephone (206) 296-4660
Facsimile (206) 296-1654

REPORT AND DECISION ON PRELIMINARY PLAT APPLICATION

SUBJECT: Department of Development and Environmental Services File No. **L98P0051**

REDMOND RIDGE SOUTH
Preliminary Plat Application

Location: South of NE Novelty Hill Road and in the central and southwestern portions of Redmond Ridge (formerly Northridge) urban planned development and fully contained community site. Northeast 80th Street (if extended) forms the southern boundary. The city of Redmond is two miles to the west and the city of Duvall is approximately four miles to the east.

Applicant: The Quadrant Corporation, *represented by*
Richard Wilson and Brian Todd, Attorneys at Law
Hillis Clark Martin & Peterson
500 Galland Building, 1221 Second Avenue
Seattle, WA 98101-2925
Telephone: (206) 623-1745 Facsimile: (206) 623-7789
e-mail: rrw@hcmp.com bd@hcmp.com

The Quadrant Corporation, *represented by*
John Eliason
11100 NE 8th Street #5
Bellevue, WA 98009

Intervenors: Joseph Elfelt and Friends Of The Law, *represented by*
Joseph Elfelt
20707 NE 120th Street
Redmond, WA 98053
e-mail: jelfelt@accessone.com

King County: Department of Development and Environmental Services, Land Use Services Division, *represented by* **Michael Sinsky**

King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office

King County Courthouse
516 – 3rd Avenue #E550
Seattle, WA 98104
Telephone: (206) 296-9015 Facsimile: (206) 296-0191
e-mail: mike.sinsky@metrokc.gov

Department of Development and Environmental Services, Land Use
Services Division, *represented by* Lisa Lee
900 Oakesdale Avenue SW
Renton, WA 98055-1219
Telephone: (206) 205-1441 Facsimile: (206) 296-6613

SUMMARY OF DECISION/RECOMMENDATIONS:

Department's Preliminary Recommendation:	Approve, subject to conditions
Department's Final Recommendation:	Approve, subject to conditions
Examiner's Decision:	Approve, subject to conditions

PRELIMINARY MATTERS:

Complete application: April 28, 1999

EXAMINER PROCEEDINGS:

Hearing Opened:	March 5, 2001
Hearing Closed:	March 9, 2001

Participants at the public hearing and the exhibits offered and entered are listed in the attached minutes. A verbatim recording of the hearing is available in the office of the King County Hearing Examiner.

ISSUES/TOPICS ADDRESSED:

- Compliance with UPD/FCC requirements
- EIS adequacy
- Traffic
- Road capacity

SUMMARY:

The preliminary plat application is approved, subject to conditions.

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS & DECISION: Having reviewed the record in this matter, the Examiner now makes and enters the following:

FINDINGS:

1. **General Information:**

Developer:	Quadrant Corporation ATTN: John Eliason PO Box 3159 Redmond, WA 98073 Telephone: (425) 836-0979
Engineer:	KPFF Consulting Engineers 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 900 Seattle, WA 98101 Telephone: (206) 622-5822
Location:	The proposal is located south of Novelty Hill Road in the central and southwestern portions of the Redmond Ridge (formerly Northridge) UPD/FCC site. The plat of Redmond Ridge North is to the north, northwest and east of Redmond Ridge South. NE 80 th Street (if extended) will form the southern boundary.
Comprehensive Plan Designation:	Urban
Zoning:	UR-P-SO
Acreage:	265 acres
Number of Lots:	486 single-family residential lots (88 medium high-density 8-14 du/acre, 398 medium density 3-10 du/acre).
Proposed Use:	Residential, business parks & recreational parks
Sewage Disposal:	City of Redmond
Water Supply:	City of Redmond
Fire District:	Fire District #34
School District:	Lake Washington School District #414
Complete Application Date:	April 28, 1999

2. Except as modified herein, the facts set forth in the King County Land Use Services Division's preliminary report to the King County Hearing Examiner for the March 5, 2001 public hearing are found to be correct and are incorporated herein by reference. The LUSD staff recommends approval of the application, subject to conditions.

PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

3. Redmond Ridge South is a preliminary plat application to subdivide 265 acres into 486 residential lots, including up to 900,000 square feet of business park uses, open space and

recreational facilities. The proposal lies entirely within the boundaries of the 1,046 acre Redmond Ridge project (formerly Northridge), which was approved by the Metropolitan King County Council as an urban planned development and a fully contained community on January 24, 1997. On February 14, 1997, the Applicant Quadrant Corporation and the King County Executive entered into a development agreement for the project site that included the terms of the UPD/FCC permit approved by the County Council. The Redmond Ridge property is a former commercial tree farm that lies near the crest of Novelty Hill. A companion project, Blakely Ridge, lies north of Redmond Ridge and received UPD approval approximately a year earlier. The impacts of two UPD proposals were analyzed concurrently, and the terms of the two UPD permits overlap to a substantial degree. Blakely Ridge has been purchased by Quadrant from the original developer, Port Blakely Communities, and has been renamed Trilogy at Redmond Ridge.

4. The Redmond Ridge South preliminary plat application was accompanied by applications to modify the Redmond Ridge UPD/FCC permit and to alter the Redmond Ridge Master Plat in order to change the location of a proposed school site. Although the hearings were conducted concurrently, the Redmond Ridge plat alteration and major modification applications will be treated in a separate decision and are subject to a separate appeal procedure.
5. A pre-hearing conference on the conjoined preliminary plat, plat alteration and major modification applications was held by the King County Hearing Examiner's Office on January 25, 2001. At that time, Joseph Elfelt and Friends of the Law were admitted to the proceeding as intervenors on the issues of traffic impacts and EIS adequacy. The notice for the pre-hearing conference invited motions to be made concerning whether the proceeding should be consolidated with the mid-point review process mandated by Section 3.9 of the UPD/FCC permit, and whether due to Redmond Ridge South's close relationship to the Redmond Ridge UPD certain issues previously determined within the UPD proceeding should be precluded from further review. The pre-hearing order provided for briefing and discovery schedules and for disclosure deadlines. It also ruled that the threshold set by the UPD permit for commencement of the project mid-point review process had not been reached.
6. An order on pre-hearing motions was issued by the Hearing Examiner on February 26, 2001. The order noted that while the Redmond Ridge development agreement and its underlying UPD/FCC permit provide the development standards and mitigation provisions applicable to the entire project over the course of its implementation, the UPD/FCC permit also creates some limited opportunities for review of the premises underlying earlier decisions. Section 3.4(a) of the UPD/FCC permit provides as follows:

“An addendum or supplemental EIS is anticipated in conjunction with the submittal of the Northridge South preliminary plat. Additional and/or modified conditions may be applied to address new, significant, adverse impacts which may be disclosed through that review process.”
7. In implementing the above-quoted permit provision, King County DDES issued an addendum to the previously published Northridge EIS on January 18, 2001. The use of an addendum rather than a supplemental EIS is authorized under WAC 197-11-600 when new information about a proposal “does not substantially change the analysis of significant impacts and alternatives in the existing environmental document”. Intervenors have challenged DDES' decision to issue an addendum rather than a supplemental EIS on the basis that there exists new information

indicating probable significant adverse environmental impacts from the plat proposal. As noted in the order, the SEPA standard for requiring issuance of an SEIS parallels Section 3.4 of the UPD/FCC permit and provides the primary criterion for evaluating whether changes in the previously issued UPD/FCC permit and its mitigation program are either warranted or authorized. The Intervenor's allegation is that Redmond Ridge South will create new, significant adverse environmental impacts not previously disclosed within the existing SEPA documents in the realm of project traffic due to the understatement of background traffic using the Novelty Hill arterial corridor and the overestimation of the capacity of existing and planned roadway facilities.

8. The order on motions also ruled that the project traffic concurrency certificate issued in 1995 is not subject to further review within this proceeding, but the 1,350 vehicle per hour eastbound P.M. peak hour capacity figure for Novelty Hill Road, which provides a trigger to certain major mitigation requirements, may be adjusted. The order also contained a ruling that the doctrines of *res judicata* and collateral estoppel do not apply to citizen testimony within a land use permit decision in which a public hearing is required by statute or ordinance.

TRAFFIC

9. Intervenor Joseph Elfelt and his community activist group, Friends of the Law, are long-time opponents of the two Novelty Hill UPD projects. Within the context of the Redmond Ridge South preliminary plat hearing, the Intervenor's principal contentions are that the plat will result in new significant adverse environmental traffic impacts not previously disclosed by environmental documents because the capacities of the arterial corridors connecting the UPDs to SR 520 to the southwest have been overestimated, while the growth in background traffic using such corridors has been underestimated. It is alleged that these two interrelated factors will result in an unsatisfactory level of service conditions not previously identified, and that this unanticipated congestion will further undermine the reliability of the traffic assignments made in the project EIS and cause spillover effects at other roadway locations.
10. Turning first to the question of background traffic growth on the arterial system serving the UPD projects, the Intervenor's position is that the Northridge EIS severely underestimated suburban growth northeast of Novelty Hill in Duvall and Monroe, and commuter traffic from these areas has absorbed the capacity within the arterial system nominally reserved for development of Redmond Ridge South. It is uncontested that background traffic growth on Novelty Hill Road in the vicinity of the UPDs has exceeded original predictions. The 1995 Northridge Draft EIS contained traffic counts for Novelty Hill Road east of its intersection with 208th Avenue Northeast that showed a P.M. peak volume in 1994 of 730 vehicles per hour. The Draft EIS predicted that background traffic at this location would grow to 820 vehicles per hour in the year 2000 and to 880 vph in 2005. In actuality, the rate of background traffic growth has exceeded these projections by a substantial margin. Traffic counts done in 2000 for the Redmond Ridge South EIS addendum describe a background traffic volume of 940 vehicles per hour, well in excess of the 2005 baseline projection.
11. While acknowledging a failure to anticipate diversion of traffic through the Novelty Hill area from Snohomish County points of origin, the Applicant's traffic engineer argues that some of the increase in background traffic on Novelty Hill Road is explained by the fact that the timing of

expected road improvements has differed from that anticipated by the Northridge EIS. In particular, Mr. Toedtli points to the fact that while new traffic lanes have been constructed on Avondale Road from the Redmond city limits north to Northeast 132nd Street, WSDOT's major lane-widening project on SR 202 east of SR 520 has been delayed. As a result, traffic counts on SR 202 east of SR 520 have actually decreased between 1994 and 2000, whereas the Northridge EIS 2005 forecast predicted such volumes to increase by about 50%. The Avondale improvements make Novelty Hill Road a more attractive arterial route, and Mr. Toedtli suggests that volume increases on Novelty Hill Road may reflect a temporary shift among alternative routes rather than a net increase in total commuter volumes.

12. The primary problem with Mr. Toedtli's hypothesis is that SR 202 is not a realistic alternative for commuter traffic traveling on Novelty Hill Road east of 208th Avenue Northeast. Traffic heading for Duvall or Monroe would not remain on SR 202 east of its intersection with 204th Place Northeast. At most, traffic oriented toward northeastern destinations might loop down SR 202 to 204th Place, then cut back north along 208th Avenue Northeast to Novelty Hill Road in order to circumvent the congestion at the Avondale Road/Union Hill Road intersection. But traffic counts taken on Novelty Hill Road east of the 208th Avenue Northeast intersection occur at a point after the diversionary loop has been completed, and therefore there is no validity to postulating a further diversionary shift to SR 202 with respect to such figures. Rather, a reduction in traffic volumes on SR 202 is more likely attributable to a shift in southerly traffic to the I-90 corridor.
13. For traffic originating northeast of the UPD sites and headed toward the Seattle/Bellevue urban area, the alternatives to Novelty Hill Road are the Woodinville-Duvall Road and SR 522. Since it is assumed that the only reason that Novelty Hill Road receives Monroe traffic at all is because of greater congestion on SR 522, for our purposes the important comparisons only include Novelty Hill Road and the Woodinville-Duvall Road. Taking as screen line points Novelty Hill Road east of 208th Avenue Northeast and Woodinville-Duvall Road west of West Snoqualmie Valley Road, we find that the 1994 actual eastbound counts were 1,135 vph during the P.M. peak hour on the two roads combined, with such combined volumes projected in the Northridge EIS to increase to 1,250 in 2000 and 1,370 by 2005. According to the addendum EIS, these counts in 2000 had increased to 1,570 which is exactly 200 vph greater than the 2005 forecast. A reasonable ballpark estimate is that commuter traffic originating northeast of the site currently has increased about 250 vph above the EIS estimates.
14. Within a broader context, an increase in overall background traffic volumes for the arterial network including Novelty Hill Road is also evidenced by traffic counts conducted at the southbound overpass from Avondale Road to SR 520. Here, Mr. Toedtli's A.M. peak hour count of 1,670 tallied in November, 2000 appears to be contradicted by WSDOT counts obtained by Mr. Elfelt for the A.M. peak over 13 weekdays in October, 1998, which show a range between 1,802 and 2,068 vehicles per hour and an average of 1,980 vph. The WSDOT figures appear to demonstrate that the 2,000 vehicle per hour capacity estimated for this overpass by the Northridge EIS is low and that its year 2005 baseline background traffic projection is being exceeded by about 500 vph.
15. As documented within the EIS Addendum, even with an unexpected increase in background traffic originating northeast of the UPD sites, improvements to the arterial system have been

adequate to prevent the level of service for the network as a whole from worsening. The 5-lane Avondale CIP has improved flows along that corridor, and the overpass at the southern terminus of Avondale onto SR 520 bypasses the LOS-F intersection that previously existed at SR 520 and SR 202. Within the Avondale corridor, the intersection with Union Hill Road remains the principal bottleneck now just as it was in 1994, and it is projected within the Northridge EIS to so remain until the City of Redmond commits to a major intersection upgrade. On Novelty Hill Road, the addition of a second free right-turn lane from Avondale has improved flow conditions during the P.M. peak hour, and scheduled interim improvements by the Redmond Ridge developer have maintained capacity by adding turn lanes along the UPD frontage and at the signal at 208th Avenue Northeast. Future UPD-funded improvements on Novelty Hill Road include turn lanes at Redmond Road and the addition of westbound lanes at the Avondale Road intersection. This latter improvement will include a dedicated right-turn lane that should eliminate northbound cut-through traffic onto Redmond Road.

16. The second prong of the Intervenor's challenge to the adequacy of the Redmond Ridge South traffic analysis is focused primarily on the capacity of Novelty Hill Road. The mitigation provisions set forth in the UPD/FCC permit are based on an estimate that Novelty Hill Road east of its intersection with 208th Avenue Northeast will have in the P.M. peak hour a capacity of 1,350 vehicles per hour in the eastbound direction after the UPDs have completed interim improvements. As implemented through an annual monitoring program, further mitigations are linked to the 1,350 vph capacity. Two backdoor connections, both north and south, are to be required of the UPD projects. The northern backdoor will traverse the Blakely Ridge UPD site and connect to Northeast 133rd Street at its intersection with 232nd Avenue Northeast. The southern backdoor goes through Redmond Ridge and outlets at 238th Avenue Northeast just north of its intersection with Union Hill Road. It is projected that when either of these backdoor connections is made, a significant amount of project traffic (as well as some background traffic) will be diverted away from Novelty Hill Road. The mechanism for triggering these improvements is that the first time the 1,350 vph eastbound P.M. peak hour figure is reached through actual counts on Novelty Hill Road, one of the backdoor connections will be made, and at the second time the 1,350 figure is reached the second backdoor will be constructed.
17. The Intervenor challenged the sufficiency of the 1,350 vph trigger on the grounds that it overestimates the capacity of Novelty Hill Road. As shown in a 1993 worksheet submitted to King County by the Transpo Group on behalf of the Applicant, the 1,350 vph methodology assumes two through-lanes of traffic expanded at key intersections with a third turning lane, lane widths of 12 feet in each direction augmented by 6 feet shoulders, a traffic split based on 60% to 65% traffic in the peak direction, and a rural 2-lane conceptual model derived from Chapter 8 of the 1985 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM). The rationale for these assumptions is explained in an April 21, 1993 letter from Larry Toedtli of Transpo to Port Blakely and Quadrant:

“For purposes of this analysis, we have opted to treat this section of Novelty Hill Road as a two-lane rural highway. As development and traffic volumes in the corridor increase, this classification may become less appropriate. Capacity of the higher volume scenarios is usually dictated by the capacity of the intersections—in this case, a future signalized intersection at 208th Avenue Northeast. We have checked the two-lane highway results with an analysis of the 208th Avenue Northeast/Novelty Hill Road intersection. We estimate that the peak direction capacity of a two to three-lane Novelty

approximately 1,400 vehicles per hour (vph). This capacity assumes a roadway with 12-foot travel lanes and 6-foot shoulders; some reconstruction would be required to meet these minimum geometrics.”

18. The Intervenors have criticized these assumptions as being too generous, resulting in a vph capacity figure that is overstated. They contend that the road widths are less than suggested, and that typing the road as rural is inaccurate due to the spacing of signalized intersections. Starting with an optimal capacity of 2,800 vph the Highway Capacity Manual provides a formula for deriving volumes in each direction based on a menu of adjustments. Greater peak direction capacity estimates are warranted with wider travel lanes and shoulders, 2 miles or more between controlled intersections, and a dominant split in favor of the peak direction.

Both greater road width and a directional split strongly in favor of the peak direction expand capacity due to increased driver comfort. A wide lane with a wide shoulder allows drivers to be comfortable at greater speeds and reduced distances between vehicles. In like manner, sparsity of traffic approaching from the opposite direction also creates comfort at higher speeds and less inter-vehicular spacing.

19. Mr. Toedtli’s measurements indicate that the width of Novelty Hill Road east of 208th Avenue Northeast from fog line to fog line is 24 feet, thus supporting his assumption of 12-foot travel lanes in each direction. The fact that perhaps 1 foot of this 24 foot span is taken up by centerline striping does not invalidate this assumption. As described by Mr. Toedtli, the shoulder width along this stretch of Novelty Hill Road comprises 4 feet of paved shoulder and 2 feet of cleared, unpaved shoulder. This testimony also supports the assumptions made in the 1993 study, but it is likely that the actual widths of the unpaved portion of the shoulder will vary from location to location.
20. The Highway Capacity Manual postulates 2 miles between controlled intersections as the basis for employing rural long-distance capacities. The sense of this is that a controlled intersection slows traffic flows and increases the likelihood of turning movements, thus decreasing effective capacity. Reflective of the effect of controlled intersections on capacity values, the County Transportation Planning Section for many years has used a link type table for estimating peak capacity in a single direction. Within the current County link type table updated in 1995, for a 24-foot wide 2-lane road with adequate shoulders the peak capacity in one direction is 1,320 vph when there is a long distance between controlled intersections, and only 760 vph when there is a traffic signal or stop sign regulating flows. The Intervenors’ position is that based on these link type values, it was incorrect for the County to approve a peak direction capacity of 1,350 vehicles per hour as a trigger mechanism for the mitigation measures when installation of traffic signals on Novelty Hill Road was an integral part of the early stages of UPD development.
21. Even though the County Integrated Transportation Program has adopted the Highway Capacity Manual as a basic reference, County transportation planners have informally used 1 mile between controlled intersections as a long-distance standard rather than the 2 miles specified by the HCM. While no compelling rationale has been provided for this choice, in the current instance it would not seem to constitute a critical factor in the analysis.

The distance along Novelty Hill Road from Avondale Road to the newly installed signal at 208th Avenue Northeast is approximately 1.62 miles. It is another .94 miles from 208th Avenue

Northeast east to the first signalized UPD intersection. The intersection of Novelty Hill Road with 208th Avenue Northeast has been recently improved with left-turn lanes and a signal. During the P.M. peak hour, Novelty Hill Road eastbound receives a significant flow of right-turning traffic from 208th Avenue Northeast. In this context, the higher volume capacity of 1,350 vph eastbound on Novelty Hill Road east of 208th Avenue Northeast is warranted because during the periods when through traffic is stopped, it will be replaced on Novelty Hill Road by the right-turning traffic from 208th. In short, the link values in the look-up table are planning references only and do not preclude determining higher capacity values based on a site-specific analysis of the kind performed for the UPD permits.

22. As pointed out by Mr. Toedtli, relevant precedent also exists for assigning a link value to Novelty Hill Road east of 208th Avenue Northeast in the 1,350 vph range based on comparable experience along SR 202 near its intersection with Sahalee Way. SR 202 at this location is a 2-lane road with turn lanes and similar intersection spacing that routinely experiences peak hour capacities in the 1,350 vph range.
23. Moreover, the 1,350 vph value is not chiseled in granite. Attachment No. 11 to the UPD/FCC permit specifically provides that the "...1,350 threshold figure may be modified by the County upon a determination that the actual traffic capacity of Novelty Hill Road at this location has been incorrectly estimated". At this point, the Intervenors at most have raised theoretical objections to the 1,350 methodology. While we find that the methodology has been adequately supported, if a point is reached where actual counts show Novelty Hill eastbound peak hour traffic reaching saturation at a lower figure, the County has ample authority to modify the trigger value. But such modification needs to be made on the basis of actual traffic counts, not by prematurely substituting Mr. Elfelt's hypothetical suppositions for those of the traffic engineers.
24. Finally, the Intervenors also spent considerable time attempting to discredit the 1,350 figure by reference to preliminary modeling runs done by the County Department of Transportation to determine whether its Novelty Hill Road CIP Environmental Impact Statement ought to include an alternative for a 5-lane configuration. These modeling runs demonstrate that including a 5-lane analysis is a reasonable EIS alternative for further detailed study based on volumes projected for a 2012 horizon year. Their use for any other purpose is inappropriate and speculative.
25. The more serious capacity limitations that constrict traffic movement to and from Novelty Hill are located further west within the system at the Avondale/Union Hill Road intersection and at the SR 520/SR 202 interchange. While these are bottlenecks within the regional transportation system that will require a solution, they constitute well-documented, chronic problems that are outside the jurisdictional authority of King County to correct. SR 520 and SR 202 are State highways under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Washington State Department of Transportation. SR 520 is, in addition, a freeway that is specifically excluded from County level of service computations.

The intersection of Avondale with Union Hill Road lies in the City of Redmond and currently operates during peak hours at a level of service F as it did previously in 1994. Both WSDOT and the City of Redmond have negotiated mitigation agreements with the UPD developers. And with

the exception of a right-turn lane improvement imposed on Blakely Ridge at the Avondale/Union Hill Road intersection, each jurisdiction has chosen to focus its mitigation requirements

elsewhere. Redmond will require Redmond Ridge to contribute to a major corridor-widening project on Union Hill Road east of the Avondale intersection, while WSDOT has requested contributions to projects on SR 202 and SR 203, both a long distance removed from the SR 520 corridor. While these earlier decisions by WSDOT and Redmond not to require major improvements by the UPDs within the Avondale to SR 520 corridor now may appear to be improvident, for our purposes the issues are moot. These congestion problems were identified during the EIS review for the two UPDs, subsequent to which mitigation decisions were made by the affected agencies, and the County has neither the authority to alter these mitigations nor a compelling need to further study previously documented problems.

NEW INFORMATION ON IMPACTS

26. We return to our review of the Novelty Hill corridor, where County jurisdiction exists to mitigate impacts and the effects of Redmond Ridge South development will be relatively the greatest. Viewing overall the background growth and capacity issues raised by Intervenor, we do not find that new information has been disclosed beyond the scope of the prior UPD environmental studies and their mitigational remedies. The 1995 Blakely Ridge UPD hearing contained considerable testimony challenging the background growth assumptions underlying the traffic volume forecasts for Novelty Hill Road. The Examiner's decision for Blakely Ridge contains a lengthy discussion of these problems, including the following summary provided at Finding No. 96:

“What the foregoing analysis indicates is that the over-capacity scenarios for 2005 described within the Blakely Ridge FEIS for Novelty Hill Road may be considerably more serious than suggested. Instead of being 11% over-capacity during the PM peak-hour, Novelty Hill Road east of 208th Avenue Northeast may experience a capacity deficit of more than 20%, with the Northridge/Blakely Ridge common frontage section proportionately more over-capacity as well. This suggests that the critical links analysis underlying the issuance of a certificate of capacity to Blakely Ridge may have been unduly optimistic in its assumptions, and the three-lane design for Novelty Hill Road may indeed prove inadequate sooner than projected.”

Further observations within the same vein occur within the Blakely Ridge report at Finding No. 160:

“Moreover, even with respect to traffic impacts where the level of cumulative analysis and mitigation appears to be most satisfactorily provided, there are major uncertainties within the data. These are a consequence of the long range impacts of the UPD projects, the complexity of the traffic circulation system and its widespread need for major systemic upgrades, and the inherent difficulties in predicting patterns of movement where a range of behavioral choices are afforded. Thus, traffic flow patterns will be heavily influenced by perceptions of where congestion is the worst, and current assumptions may prove invalid if major systemic upgrades within the Avondale Road and SR 520 corridors prove less efficacious than projected. Moreover, the adequacy of planned road facility improvements will depend largely on the reliability of estimates of background traffic growth, which figures are based on questionable assumptions.”

A similar discussion is also found within the Examiner's 1996 Northridge decision, where the following statement appears in Finding No. 189:

“...the sheer complexity of the relevant transportation network combined with unavoidable certainties about the construction schedule for both the two UPDs and critical public road projects serving the area interjects a speculative element into the process which cannot be eliminated through further refinements in traffic data.”

27. The quotations provided above occur within the context of a discussion of two modifications to the mitigation process for the UPDs imposed as a consequence of the public hearing process. The more important of these is the mid-point review set forth at Section 3.9 of the UPD/FCC permit. This review is to occur at the point where building permits have been issued for 2,500 dwelling units at the two UPDs together, and is to be particularly focused on three contentious topics, one of which is the “adequacy of Novelty Hill Road and other area roads and intersections impacted by Northridge and Blakely Ridge development to meet adopted service standards”. Among the specific elements of the mid-point review process spelled out for Novelty Hill Road are the accuracy of background traffic level forecasts, traffic levels generated by the UPD, identification of LOS-F intersections impacted by UPD traffic, and identification of critical road links impacted by UPD traffic that are over-capacity.
28. A second outcome of the public hearing process with respect to traffic impact mitigation was a modification of the provisions relating to operation of the 1,350 vph trigger on Novelty Hill Road. One of these changes has already been alluded to, that the 1,350 figure may be modified if the actual capacity of Novelty Hill Road proves to be lower. The second modification involved the addition of a further mitigation requirement to the roster of remedies triggered by the 1,350 vph threshold. This requirement provides that after both the northern and southern backdoor connections are constructed, if the 1,350 vph threshold is again reached and the County does not have construction funding for the Novelty Hill Road CIP programmed, a moratorium shall be placed on further building permits for the two UPDs “unless new mitigation is identified and funded which either reduces the volumes below the 1,350 threshold or provides increased capacity to Novelty Hill Road sufficient to accommodate the additional traffic volumes from the UPDs”.
29. In summary, both the background traffic volume increase and 1,350 vph capacity scenarios identified by the Intervenor as undermining the reliability of the UPD traffic mitigation program were identified and analyzed within the prior public hearing process and appropriate changes made to the UPD/FCC permit conditions to accommodate these possibilities. As repeatedly emphasized by both County staff and the Applicant, the only real consequence of an increase in background traffic on Novelty Hill Road above the levels projected by the Northridge EIS is that the 1,350 triggers will be reached sooner than originally anticipated. And if the menu of mitigations triggered by the 1,350 vph threshold becomes exhausted and traffic volumes continue to grow, a moratorium will be imposed on all further UPD development until either the Novelty Hill CIP is funded or new alternative mitigations implemented. While we agree with Mr. Elfelt that there appears to be an increase in background traffic volumes from areas northeast of the UPD sites beyond those originally forecast in the earlier EIS documents, the increase is relatively modest and within the range anticipated by the mitigation measures. In order to establish that the current mitigation measures should be abandoned in favor of a more severe program, the deviation from predicted traffic levels would need to be so extreme as to render the 1,350 trigger

mechanism incapable of responding effectively to the problem. The increase in background traffic volumes described by the current data do not approach such level of extremity, and no

compelling rationale exists at this time for concluding that the current mitigation mechanisms cannot function adequately.

30. Construction of Redmond Ridge South also will entail the resolution of an array of relatively minor technical problems within the external boundaries of the UPD site itself. These include the eventual need to install signals where some of the internal access roads from the business park intersect Redmond Ridge Drive at the point when traffic volumes warrant such mitigation. These issues are of a routine nature and adequately discussed within the DDES staff report.

In addition, an evening hearing was held in the Novelty Hill community at which time local residents had the opportunity to express their concerns with overall UPD development as well as the specific impacts of Redmond Ridge South. Quadrant has recently installed a new signal at the intersection of 208th Avenue Northeast and Union Hill Road, and many residents testified that without a left-turn lane from Union Hill to 208th or a left-turn signal phase, the traffic queues backing up behind the intersection in the eastbound direction continue to exist. While signal phasing can be adjusted to accommodate traffic demands, a dedicated left-turn lane is beyond the scope of mitigations required of the UPD development and may necessitate a County-funded improvement. In like manner, increased traffic volumes along 208th Avenue Northeast between Union Hill and Novelty Hill Roads may eventually require upgraded pedestrian facilities in order to provide an adequate level of safety.

CONCLUSIONS:

1. The common sense perception that underlies both the Intervenor's SEPA challenge and the traffic comments of neighborhood residents at the community meeting is that the arterial network serving the Novelty Hill area is approaching capacity use and all building activity should cease until the road system is fixed. While this viewpoint has a straightforward appeal, upon examination its implementation would be in conflict with the GMA-based land use regulatory system currently in place and in the long term lead to regulatory chaos rather than improved traffic impact management. The reasons for this are as follows:
 - a. The traffic mitigations imposed upon Redmond Ridge are based on full build-out of the UPD. While these mitigations will not solve all the problems afflicting the regional road system, they nonetheless contribute important upgrades that are part of the solution. Some of these mitigations are being provided in advance of traffic impacts from the project. If a moratorium is placed on further project development without a supporting finding that the UPD mitigations are legally insufficient, then the County would also be obligated to relieve Redmond Ridge of its mitigation burden for that portion of the project subject to the moratorium.
 - b. The arterial network that serves the Novelty Hill area contains not only King County road facilities but also facilities within the City of Redmond and under the jurisdiction of the State Department of Transportation. Both WSDOT and Redmond have reached

agreements with the UPDs concerning the mitigations required. No legal basis exists for revisiting these issues in this proceeding. King County has been responsive to performing its regional road construction responsibilities within the Novelty Hill area,

and Redmond Ridge has been timely and efficient in constructing the mitigation facilities for which it is obligated. Redmond Ridge traffic will provide a relatively minor component of the traffic flows that will pass through such bottlenecks as the Avondale/Union Hill Road intersection in Redmond and the SR 520 on-ramp under WSDOT jurisdiction. The ultimate solution to these regional problems is public support for financial commitments by WSDOT and Redmond to make the needed improvements, not continued expropriation of a developer that has responsibly performed its obligations.

- c. The Growth Management Act is an imperfect instrument, but at this point in time it is the only planning tool that we have. If one undermines the structure of concurrency commitments authorized by the GMA, the long-term effect will be to make the problems worse, not better. In the context of our discussion, the GMA shortcoming most visibly apparent is the absence of compulsory regional planning and funding for major arterial improvements that serve multi-jurisdictional needs. The answer to that shortcoming is to strengthen the GMA regional planning process. It would be counter-productive to undermine the process by refusing to honor concurrency commitments made 6 years ago on the rationale that capacity reserved to the UPD developers has been usurped by background traffic growth originating in locations not subject to the County concurrency certification program. Prior concurrency commitments to developers who are endeavoring to play by the rules need to be honored. A moratorium that fails to honor these commitments can only undermine the integrity and credibility of the GMA process, and simply impels that process towards failure and collapse. If the GMA fails to work, the likely consequence will not be its replacement by a better system but rather a return to the prior policy of unregulated growth.
2. The Intervenor's have challenged DDES' decision to employ an EIS addendum for further analysis of the environmental impacts of Redmond Ridge South development. Intervenor's contend that a supplemental EIS should have been required because there exists new information indicating, or on, the proposal's probable significant adverse traffic impacts. Under State law, the DDES decision to issue an EIS addendum rather than a supplemental EIS is entitled to substantial weight on review and may not be overturned unless clearly erroneous based on the record as a whole.
3. The record demonstrates that traffic impacts, including background traffic growth and the capacity of the Novelty Hill Road arterial corridor, were extensively studied in prior UPD EIS documents, and capacity bottlenecks and level of service issues were identified therein. Moreover, the uncertainties surrounding certain key data relating to background traffic and capacity were identified and discussed within the Hearing Examiner's UPD decisions, and mitigations for such problems were provided in the UPD/FCC permit in the form of traffic volume triggers for mitigation requirements and a mid-point review process to evaluate the actual impacts of the project.

The capacity and background growth issues raised by the Intervenor's fall within the scope of variability contemplated by the prior environmental documents, the Examiner's UPD decisions,

and the UPD/FCC permit mitigation provisions. Accordingly, the documents and testimony introduced by the Intervenor at the Redmond Ridge South hearing do not constitute new information on the proposal's probable significant adverse environmental impacts within the

meaning of SEPA, and the decision by DDES not to require a supplemental EIS is supported by the evidence of record. In addition, the evidence introduced by the Intervenor does not meet the threshold set by UPD/FCC permit Section 3.4(a) for the imposition of additional or modified UPD conditions to address new significant adverse impacts disclosed through the plat review process.

4. The Redmond Ridge South preliminary plat application complies with the requirements set forth in the UPD/FCC permit adopted by the King County Council on January 10, 1997 and January 24, 1997, as incorporated within the development agreement executed by the King County Executive on February 14, 1997. The plat is in conformity with the zoning and land use controls contained in the UPD/FCC permit and development agreement and in effect on the property on the date that a complete preliminary plat application was filed.
5. If approved subject to the conditions imposed below, the proposed subdivision makes appropriate provision for the public health, safety and welfare; serves the public use and interest; and meets the requirements of RCW 58.17.110.
6. The conditions of approval imposed herein, including dedications and easements, will provide improvements that promote legitimate public purposes, are necessary to serve the subdivision and are proportional to its impacts; are required to make the proposed plat reasonably compatible with the environment; and will carry out applicable state laws and regulations and the laws, policies and objectives of King County.

DECISION:

The preliminary plat application for Redmond Ridge South, as revised and received December 11, 2000 is APPROVED, subject to the following conditions of final approval:

1. Compliance with all platting provisions of the King County Subdivision Code.
2. All persons having an ownership interest in the subject property shall sign on the face of the final plat a dedication which includes the language set forth in King County Council Motion No. 5952.
3. All terms and conditions of the Redmond Ridge UPD/FCC Permit, as amended, or as provided herein, shall also be terms and conditions of the Redmond Ridge South Plat approval.
4. The applicant shall obtain the approval of the King County Fire Protection Engineer for certifying the adequacy of the fire hydrant, water main, and fire flow standards to meet the standards of KCC 17.08.
5. Lots and parcels within the Welcome Lake watershed shall be subject to a covenant waiving the right to protest formation of a lake management district as outlined in the Redmond Ridge

UPD/FCC permit section 2.2.7.e.

6. The Effective Impervious Area (EIA) in each drainage subbasin shall not exceed the EIA stated in the MDP Update. The maximum allowed percent impervious area coverage for single family residential lots shall be identified for each development parcel (K, L, O, P, Q, R, S and T) prior to final plat recording for those parcels.
7. Engineering plans shall be prepared in accordance with the design requirements outlined in the County Road Engineer's letter shown in Attachment 6 to the DDES staff report. A new road classification map and a new road design summary table are also provided as Attachments 4 and 5. These documents supplement the UPD Permit Attachments 8, 9, and 10.
8. All planter strips, medians, and cul-de-sac bulb landscaping and irrigation shall be maintained by the Redmond Ridge Homeowners Association or equivalent organization.
9. Drainage plans shall be prepared in accordance with the Northridge Master Drainage Plan dated April 1996 and the Redmond Ridge Master Drainage Plan Update dated December 2000, or subsequent updates, and as required by the Redmond Ridge UPD/FCC Permit.
10. If it is necessary to relocate or replace an existing monitoring well and to ensure that it will continue to be accessible to a public road and to provide the groundwater hydrology level monitoring intended in the Permit, then the following requirements, or equivalent provisions approved by King County, shall be met:
 - a. The replacement well shall be installed and monitored for a minimum of 6 months prior to discontinuing the monitoring of the original well.
 - b. The monitoring results of the original and replacement wells shall be compared and analyzed to establish a definitive correlation between the two sets of monitoring results.
 - c. Should a correlation not be determined with the required 6-months of data, both wells must be monitored for up to an additional 6-months to establish baseline values for the replacement well.
 - d. The installation of the replacement well and the removal of the existing well shall be done in accordance with Washington State Department of Health regulations.
 - e. Copies of all monitoring results for the relocation of the monitoring well shall be provided to Union Hill Water Association.
11. A legally binding agreement or covenant between the UPD/FCC developer, the County, and the homebuilder shall be recorded prior to any final plat approval or commercial building permit that includes lots or multi-family parcels where affordable housing will be built. This condition shall be carried out consistent with the UPD/FCC Permit Section 1.4.
12. At each proposed construction phase, the applicant shall submit a Retained Vegetation Plan to DDES for its review and approval. Each Retained Vegetation Plan shall identify stands of

existing native trees and understory vegetation to be retained at that phase of construction. The applicable Retained Vegetation Plan must be approved before engineering plan approval for development permits in that construction phase.

13. Prior to recording the first plat in Redmond Ridge South, the applicant shall submit to DDES for review and approval a proposal for implementing the King County-approved Redmond Ridge Community-wide Design Guidelines in Redmond Ridge South, pursuant to UPD/FCC permit Section 2.4.6.
14. The applicant shall provide recreational amenities consistent with the conceptual design for the South Park submitted to DDES February 17, 2000. Park design and development shall comply with Section 2.7.1(e) of the UPD/FCC Permit and is subject to King County review and approval.
15. If Parcels R and S develop at 10 du/ac or greater, recreational space will be required as provided in KCC 21A.14.180 and Section 2.7.1(f) of the UPD/FCC Permit.
16. Recreational opportunities including a large children's play structure shall be provided within the neighborhood park in Parcel T, subject to King County review and approval.
17. A conceptual plan for each neighborhood park shall be shown on the landscaping plans for each of the 3-10 du/acre residential development nodes.
18. The Applicant shall provide a signal warrant analysis for the intersection of Redmond Ridge Drive/NE 108th Street (Marketplace Drive) with the Annual Traffic Monitoring Report.
 - a. When the report indicates proposed permit activity in the next calendar year will result in the satisfaction of traffic signal warrants, engineering plans for the signalization system shall be submitted to DDES and reviewed and approved by King County Traffic Engineering.
 - b. The Applicant shall "commence construction" (as defined in Attachment "H" of Attachment 11 of the UPD/FCC permit) of the traffic signal at this intersection in conjunction with the issuance of the building permits that would result in achievement of the signal warrants.
19. The Applicant shall provide a signal warrant analysis for the intersection of Redmond Ridge Drive/NE 104th Street (NE Alder Crest Dr.) with the Annual Traffic Monitoring Report.
 - a. When the report indicates proposed permit activity in the next calendar year will result in the satisfaction of traffic signal warrants, engineering plans for the signalization system shall be submitted to DDES and reviewed and approved by King County Traffic Engineering.
 - b. The Applicant shall "commence construction" (as defined in Attachment "H" of Attachment 11 of the UPD/FCC permit) of the traffic signal at this intersection in

conjunction with the issuance of the building permits that would result in achievement of the signal warrants.

20. All streets accessing the future business park located on the east side of Redmond Ridge Drive shall be connected via private “reciprocal easements” between all lots within the business park.

The connections shall allow traffic to traverse between each cul-de-sac street (NE 101st PL and NE 98th PL) and the business loop road (NE 104th St./NE 108th St.). The design of these easement routes shall be reviewed and approved at the time of building permit applications of the business park lots.

ORDERED this 22nd day of March, 2001.

Stafford L. Smith
King County Hearing Examiner

TRANSMITTED this 22nd day of March, 2001, to the parties and interested persons of record.

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

In order to appeal the decision of the Examiner, written notice of appeal must be filed with the Clerk of the King County Council with a fee of \$125.00 (check payable to King County Office of Finance) *on or before April 5, 2001*. If a notice of appeal is filed, the original and six (6) copies of a written appeal statement specifying the basis for the appeal and argument in support of the appeal must be filed with the Clerk of the King County Council *on or before April 12, 2001*. Appeal statements may refer only to facts contained in the hearing record; new facts may not be presented on appeal.

Filing requires actual delivery to the Office of the Clerk of the Council, Room 403, King County Courthouse, prior to the close of business (4:30 p.m.) on the date due. Prior mailing is not sufficient if actual receipt by the Clerk does not occur within the applicable time period. The Examiner does not have authority to extend the time period unless the Office of the Clerk is not open on the specified closing date, in which event delivery prior to the close of business on the next business day is sufficient to meet the filing requirement.

If a written notice of appeal and filing fee are not filed within fourteen (14) calendar days of the date of this report, or if a written appeal statement and argument are not filed within twenty-one (21) calendar days of the date of this report, the decision of the hearing examiner contained herein shall be the final decision of King County without the need for further action by the Council.

Please note that the Redmond Ridge South preliminary plat decision and the recommendation regarding Redmond Ridge permit major modification and plat alteration are subject to separate appeal procedures.

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 6, 7, 8 AND 9, 2001 PUBLIC HEARING ON DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES FILE NOS. L98P0051, L00MI124, L01ALT01 – REDMOND RIDGE SOUTH:

Stafford L. Smith was the Hearing Examiner in this matter. Participating in the hearing and representing the King County Department of Development and Environmental Services was Lisa Lee from DDES, and Dennis McMahon and Michael Sinsky from the King County Prosecuting Attorney’s Office. Participating in this hearing and representing the King County Department of Transportation was David Mark and Kristen Langley. Participating in the hearing and representing the Applicant were Attorneys Richard Wilson and Brian Todd. Participating in the hearing and representing Intervenors Joseph Elfelt and Friends of

the Law was Joseph Elfelt. Participating in this hearing as either Witnesses or Interested Persons offering public testimony were: Mark Veldee, Richard Lowe, Barbara Chilcote, Larry Toedtli, Kerry Kriner, Grace Yuan, Steve Cole, Bill Hoffman, Greg Borba, Irin LaMargo, Jesse Krail., John Shively, William Oakes, John Eliason, Paulette Norman, Aileen McManus, Roy Bingman, Rich Hudson, Steve O'Donnell, Wayne Berthold, Jim Cushing, Tom Berkowicz, Meredith Mechling, Deborah Healy, P. G. Phillips, Kris Colt, Nancy Temkin, Barbara Beason, Jeff Cook, Vito Mickus, Linda Grez, David Chenault, Doug Dedo, Brian Derdowski, David Randle and Connie Berkowicz.

The following exhibits for DDES File No. L98P0051 were offered and entered into the record:

- Exhibit No. 1 DDES File No. L98P0051
- Exhibit No. 2 DDES Staff Report dated March 5, 2001
- Exhibit No. 3 Preliminary Plat Map, dated December 11, 2000
- Exhibit No. 4 EIS Addendum, dated January, 2001
- Exhibit No. 5 Master Drainage Plan, dated April, 1996
- Exhibit No. 6 Master Drainage Plan update, dated December 8, 2000
- Exhibit No. 7 Stormwater Management Facilities Map
- Exhibit No. 8 Drainage Basins
- Exhibit No. 9 Evans Creek Central Basin Map
- Exhibit No. 10 Evans Creek West Basin Map
- Exhibit No. 11 Bear Creek Basin Map
- Exhibit No. 12 Road Classification Map
- Exhibit No. 13 Road Standards Variance No. L00V0023
- Exhibit No. 14 Conceptual Park Plan
- Exhibit No. 15 UPD/FCC Permit and Modifications Notebook
- Exhibit No. 16 UPD/FCC Permit Attachment 3 Map
- Exhibit No. 17 Development Status Map, dated March, 2001
- Exhibit No. 18 Off-site Road Projects Map
- Exhibit No. 19 Redmond Ridge and Blakely Ridge UPD Off-site Road Improvement EIS Addendum, dated November, 2000
- Exhibit No. 20 Aerial photograph of Redmond Ridge (taken February 2001)
- Exhibit No. 21 Redmond Settlement Agreement (RSA), Recording No. 9705201514
- Exhibit No. 22 Quadrant's RSA letter to Mayor Ives and Executive Sims, dated October 7, 1999
- Exhibit No. 23 City of Redmond/King County Interlocal Agreement for Reciprocal Collection of Transportation Impact Fees, dated December, 1999
- Exhibit No. 24 Conceptual Master Plan, dated March, 2001
- Exhibit No. 25 Large Vicinity Map of Redmond Ridge South
- Exhibit No. 26 RRS Brochure "You and Your Environment"
- Exhibit No. 27 RRS Brochure "Trail Map"
- Exhibit No. 28 Resume of Mark Veldee
- Exhibit No. 29 Amended page 8 of DDES staff report
- Exhibit No. 30 Larry Toedtli Resume
- Exhibit No. 31 Larry Toedtli Bear Creek Project Experience
- Exhibit No. 32 North Ridge Draft EIS
- Exhibit No. 33 Appendix Volume 4 North Ridge Draft EIS
- Exhibit No. 34 Final EIS, Northridge Urban Planned Development
- Exhibit No. 35 County Public Rules
- Exhibit No. 36 Memo to Rich Hudson from Mr. Krail to signed by Mr. Hoffman
- Exhibit No. 37 *Excluded*
- Exhibit No. 38 Letter to Mr. Borba from Mr. Elfelt dated 11-98 with attachment
- Exhibit No. 39 Letter from Mr. Haff dated 10-28-93 indicating that he had received request-is cc'd to Mr. Hoffman
- Exhibit No. 40 Memo from Transpo Group changing calculation from 1300 to 1350
- Exhibit No. 41 Calculation attached to a Report
- Exhibit No. 42 Memo dated 4-21-93 to John Adams, Spangenberg from Mr. Toedtli
- Exhibit No. 43 Highway Capacity Manual Special Report 209, dated 1985
- Exhibit No. 44 Length/Type Estimated Capacity Relationships dated 4-15-93
- Exhibit No. 45 Letter dated 11-20-98 to Mr. Elfelt from Mr. Hoffman
- Exhibit No. 46 Letter dated 12-8-97 signed by Mr. Hoffman re Novelty Hill Road Info Request
- Exhibit No. 47 Letter dated 6-3-98 from Mr. Hoffman to Mr. Elfelt

L98P0051-Redmond Ridge South

19

- Exhibit No. 48 Large document 3 separate groups of pages-cover page shows diagram of NE Novelty Hill Rd
- Exhibit No. 49 UPD Off-Site Road Mitigation Project Status Sheet/RRS
- Exhibit No. 50 Letter to Examiner Smith from David Edwards, WSDOT, dated August 25, 2000 with 2 attachments
- Exhibit No. 51 WSDOT Sunshine Report, dated March 5, 2001
- Exhibit No. 52 E-mail correspondence between Mark Mitchell and Lewis Ngyuen, and parties cc'd.
- Exhibit No. 53 Request for information based on the Freedom of Information Act
- Exhibit No. 54 Discovery request by Joseph Elfelt and FOTL to King County DOT
- Exhibit No. 55 Technical Report for Novelty Hill Widening Project, dated June, 1997
- Exhibit No. 56 King County interrogatory
- Exhibit No. 57 Mark Mitchell interrogatory
- Exhibit No. 58 Interrogatory and request for production/traffic expert
- Exhibit No. 59A Novelty Hill turning movements modeling data, June 1998
- Exhibit No. 59B Novelty Hill Road, 2012 Baseline, No-Build, bottleneck, PM peak
- Exhibit No. 59C Novelty Hill Road, 2012 Baseline, 5/3 Scenario, bottleneck, PM peak
- Exhibit No. 59D Novelty Hill Road: 2012 Baseline, 5-Lane Scenario, PM peak
- Exhibit No. 59E Diagrams for Sim traffic run (3/5—March 8, 2001)
- Exhibit No. 59F Diagrams for Sim traffic run (5/5—March 7, 2001)
- Exhibit No. 60A E-mail correspondence between Joseph Elfelt and Mr. Gibbons from WSDOT, regarding traffic counts, dated February 12, 2001
- Exhibit No. 60B Traffic counts in the westbound (aka southbound) direction
- Exhibit No. 60C 5/20 counts in eastbound direction above SR 202.
- Exhibit No. 61 Backdoor traffic study from Transpo (draft), Larry Toedtli to Lisa Lee.
- Exhibit No. 62 Proposed, but not yet entered. This exhibit may be excluded altogether. If so, just type in Excluded beside Exhibit No. 62 in italics.
- Exhibit No. 63 EMME2, Site NFI Distribution page 3 only
- Exhibit No. 64 EMME2, Site BFI Distribution page 3 only
- Exhibit No. 65 Input Worksheet, Project No. SAAOPL.CF1, dated September 22, 1995
- Exhibit No. 66A Traffic counts for SR 202 to Sahalee Way, dated December 16, 1998
- Exhibit No. 66B Traffic counts for SR 202 to 204th Place NE, dated November 4, 1998
- Exhibit No. 66C Traffic counts for SR 202 to 187th Ave. NE, dated August 16, 2000
- Exhibit No. 67 Diagram of road measurements done by Steve O'Donnell, dated March 8, 2001
- Exhibit No. 68 Traffic survey completed by Wayne Berthold, dated February, 2001
- Exhibit No. 69 Traffic survey completed by P.G. Phillips, dated February and March, 2001
- Exhibit No. 70 Traffic survey completed by Kris Colt, dated February and March, 2001
- Exhibit No. 71 Redmond Ridge website page, submitted by Jeff Cook and produced March 8, 2001
- Exhibit No. 72 Traffic survey completed by Vito Mickus, dated March, 2001
- Exhibit No. 73 A collection of e-mails and traffic surveys sent or given to Joseph Elfelt, FOTL representative, for the purpose of the March 8, 2001 Community Hearing.
- Exhibit No. 74 Traffic survey completed by David Randle
- Exhibit No. 75 Trafficcount Report dated November 30, 2000 (entered by applicant - Mr. Wilson)
- Exhibit No. 76 King County Public Rules and Regulations Web site Public Rules Dated March 9, 2001
- Exhibit No. 77 Redmond Ridge South Preliminary Plat File #L98L0051 DDES revised Recommended Conditions
- Exhibit No. 78 Memo to Joe Miles from Ron Paananen, dated October 19, 2000
- Exhibit No. 79A Redmond Ridge/Blakeley Ridge UPDS Traffic Monitoring Program First Annual Report, dated September 8, 1999
- Exhibit No. 79B Annual Traffic Monitoring Program dated February 4, 2000
- Exhibit No. 79C Annual Traffic Monitoring Program dated December 21, 2000
- Exhibit No. 80 Redmond Ridge Transit Plan dated October 19, 2000
- Exhibit No. 81 Letter to Hearing Examiner from Meredith Mechling

SLS:sje
Plats/L98P0051 RPT