

April 9, 2021

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

King County Courthouse
516 Third Avenue Room 1200
Seattle, Washington 98104
Telephone (206) 477-0860
hearingexaminer@kingcounty.gov
www.kingcounty.gov/independent/hearing-examiner

REPORT AND DECISION

SUBJECT: Department of Local Services file no. **PLAT190003**
Proposed ordinance no.: **2021-0076**

LEARY FLOYD ASSEMBLAGE
SEPA Threshold Determination Appeal

Location:

[REDACTED] Sammamish

Applicant:

Toll Brothers, Inc
represented by Jay Derr
Van Ness Feldman
1191 Second Avenue Suite 1800
Seattle, WA 98101
Telephone: (206) 623-9372
Email: jpd@vnf.com

Appellants:

Shishir Abhyanker and Shipra Kulkarni
[REDACTED]
Sammamish, WA 98074
Email: [REDACTED]

Appellant:

Abinash Das
[REDACTED]
Sammamish, WA 98074
Email: [REDACTED]

King County: Department of Local Services
represented by **Kimberly Claussen**
 35030 SE Douglas Street, Suite 210
 Snoqualmie, WA 98065
 Telephone: (206) 477-0329
 Email: kimberly.claussen@kingcounty.gov

RECOMMENDATIONS/DECISION:

Department’s Preliminary Recommendation:	Deny Appeals
Department’s Final Recommendation:	Deny Appeals
Examiner’s Decision:	Deny Appeals

After hearing the witnesses’ testimony and observing their demeanor, studying the exhibits admitted into evidence, and considering the parties’ arguments and the relevant law, the Examiner enters the following Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law:

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Overview:

1. The proposal is a 17-lot plat (Project) on three parcels totaling 4.87 acres (after completion of a boundary line adjustment (BLA)) in the R-4 zone (Property). The Property is located in the Swan Ridge Potential Annexation Area for the City of Sammamish. Testimony of Jeff Peterson. The area was formerly rural, but it is in the process being developed and built out to its intended and planned density.
2. The responsible official issued a threshold Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) on January 12, 2021. Ex. D4. Abinash Das (Appellant Das) and Shishir Abhyanker and Shipra Kulkarni (Appellant Abhyanker) (collectively Appellants) timely appealed the DNS. Ex. D20.
3. Appellants own homes and reside within the Woodhaven II plat (formerly known as Shillam) adjacent to the west of proposed Lots 16-17. Ex. T8-003; testimony of Abinash Das and Shishir Abhyanker. Appellant Abhyanker’s property is shown as parcel 1610 on Ex. T8-014 and Lot 2 on Ex. T9-001; Appellant Das’ property is shown as parcel 1602 on Ex. T8-014 and Lot 1 on Ex. T9-001.
4. The Examiner consolidated the SEPA appeal hearing with the hearing on the preliminary plat. On March 2, 2021, a Revised Pre-Hearing Order and Notice of Consolidated Video/Telephonic Hearings (Pre-Hearing Order) was sent to parties and interested persons. The consolidated hearings were conducted via ZOOM and telephone on March 26, 2021.

5. The Examiner included in the records for both the SEPA appeal and the preliminary plat all of the testimony offered and exhibits entered at the consolidated hearing.
6. As set forth in the Pre-Hearing Order, the issues/claims in the SEPA appeal are limited to proposed Lots 16 and 17 and are as follows:
 - A. Whether Lots 16 and 17 will cause significant adverse impacts on wetlands or greenery.
 - B. Whether grading of proposed Lots 16 and 17 will create significant adverse drainage, flooding, or erosion impacts.
 - C. Whether the proposed location of the driveway serving proposed Lots 16 and 17 will cause significant adverse traffic safety and noise impacts.
 - D. Whether the building envelopes on Lots 16 and 17 will create adverse impacts to aesthetics, security, or privacy.
7. As used in the SEPA rules, a “significant” impact is not equivalent to “any” impact as Appellants contend. Ex. A3-001; testimony Abinash Das. Rather significant is defined as “a reasonable likelihood of more than moderate adverse impact on environmental quality.” WAC 197-11-794.
8. The Property is within an urban growth area. Pursuant to RCW 43.21C.240, the County adopted KCC 20.44.080.C, which provides:

Within the urban growth areas, substantive SEPA authority to condition or deny new development proposals or other actions shall be used only in cases where specific adverse impacts are not addressed by regulations as set forth below or unusual circumstances exist. (Emphasis added).

The enumerated regulations include the following chapters of the King County Code (KCC or Code) relevant to this appeal: Chapter 9.04, Surface Water Runoff Policy; Chapter 9.08, Surface Water Management Program; Chapter 9.12, Water Quality; Chapter 14.42, King County Road Standards; Chapter 16.82, Clearing and Grading; Chapter 21A.12, Development Standards - Density and Dimensions; Chapter 21A.16, Development Standards - Landscaping and Water Use; and Chapter 21A.24, Critical Areas.

Wetlands and Greenery Concerns

9. Because of the impact of extensive regulated critical areas on the site design, the Applicant, Toll Brothers, Inc., applied for and received a critical areas determination prior to designing and submitting its application for a preliminary plat. Testimony of Jeff Peterson.

10. The critical areas are comprised of Wetland B, a Category III wetland requiring a 75-foot buffer; Wetland C, a category III wetland requiring a 125-foot buffer due to its higher habitat score; and the Allen Lake Outlet Channel, a Type F Aquatic Area requiring a 165-foot buffer. Ex. D14.
11. The Applicant proposes buffer averaging to allow the creation of Lots 5, 16, and 17. Exs. D6-001; T8-005; T14-002. The County determined that the buffer averaging plan complies with KCC 21A.24.325.B and will provide equivalent or better-functioning buffers around the wetlands than existing conditions. Testimony of Laura Casey.
12. Track E will contain the critical areas and their buffers. It comprises 54% of the site area. Ex. T8-006; testimony of Laura Casey.
13. Lots 16 and 17 are separated from Lots 1-15 by the critical area tract. The Applicant proposes a trail along the outer (western) edge of the wetland buffer to provide Lots 16 and 17 access to the recreation improvements in Tract A. Ex. T10-001. The proposed trail is not addressed in the most recent wetland buffer averaging plan, Ex. T14. The maximum width of the trail will be 3 feet; its surface will be pervious. The buffer averaging plan will be revised to subtract the area of the trail from the wetland buffer and to recalculate the area of the buffer to ensure that there is no net loss of buffer area as required by KCC 21A.24.325.B.2.a. Mitigation will be required for the trail. Testimony of Laura Casey. *See also*, condition 18 of the Report and Decision on the preliminary plat which incorporates these requirements.
14. Appellant Abhyanker questioned whether the buffer averaging complies with the Code given the location of the proposed trail and his contention that the Allen Lake is migrating to the west. Testimony of Shishir Abhyanker; Ex. A4-002-003. As found above, the buffer averaging plan will be revised to subtract the area of the trail; to be approved the remaining buffer area must provide area equivalent to the standard buffers; mitigation will be required. The Allen Lake Outlet Channel is addressed under Drainage, Flooding, and Erosion Concerns below.
15. The Applicant proposes additional trees in the buffer area located between Lots 16 and 17 and Wetland C. Ex. D10(C).

Drainage, Flooding, and Erosion Concerns

16. Issue B asks whether grading of proposed Lots 16 and 17 will create significant adverse drainage, flooding, or erosion impacts. However, Appellants presented no evidence or testimony on the effect of grading of these Lots. Nevertheless, in their exhibits and testimony, Appellants presented many questions about the Project's stormwater system and potential effects on downstream flooding. Given the Appellants' lack of familiarity with the appeal process and the need to provide context for issues that are within the scope of the appeal, the Examiner addresses those questions/concerns below.
17. Lots 16-17 are adjacent to the critical area buffers. The SWDM establishes a hierarchy of ways to administer flow control, with infiltration being the highest priority. Infiltration is

not possible on this site due to soil conditions. The second highest priority is full dispersion, which is proposed for these two lots. The runoff generated by impervious surfaces on these two lots will connect to dispersal trenches that disperse the runoff through the critical areas buffers, achieving both the required flow control and maintaining wetland hydrology. Once the discharge has achieved a 100-foot flowpath through a native vegetated area on site, such as the wetland buffer in this case, the discharge from the impervious surfaces is considered the same rate as if the property remained fully forested. Testimony of Maher Joudi and Ed McCarthy; Ex. T8-007.

18. Stormwater and potential flooding effects from proposed Lots 1-15 are outside of the scope of the SEPA appeal. The Examiner discusses these Lots to provide context for the findings below on the stability of the Allen Creek Outlet Channel. The proposed preliminary plat is located in a Conservation Flow Control area that discharges to the east to the Allen Lake Outfall Channel. The Outfall Channel has been documented as a Type 3 severe flooding problem. Consequently, under the Surface Water Design Manual (SWDM), the Applicant is required to provide Level 3 Flow Control as well as Basic Water Quality treatment. The Level 3 standard seeks to match flow *durations* from Lots 1-15 in the developed state to discharges occurring in historic conditions (which treat the site as if it were fully forested) for storm durations ranging from 50% of the 2-year storm up to the 50-year storm. It matches flow *rates* up to the 100-year storm. This means that there will be no overflow from the stormwater detention vault system serving Lots 1-15 in storms up to and including the 100-year storm. The drainage plan would reduce the project area peak runoff rate from .077 ft.³ per second in existing conditions to 0.15 ft.³ per second in developed conditions. Exs. D1, D12-001; testimony of Maher Joudi and Ed McCarthy.
19. To examine potential flooding impacts downstream, Dr. McCarthy performed a Level 3 downstream analysis (Ex. D13) that considered the cumulative impacts of the proposed preliminary plat as well as six recently approved projects in the vicinity, including Woodhaven II. These projects are shown on Ex. D13-008. Each of these projects uses Level 3 flow control, the most stringent standard in the SWMD. The simulation resulted in no rise in the maximum predicted water surface elevations. Ex. D13-005-006; testimony of Ed McCarthy.
20. Based on a comparison of 2017 and 2019 King County iMap aerial photographs, Appellant Abhyanker testified that the Allen Lake Outlet Channel appears to have moved 1-1.5 feet to the west, closer to his property.
21. iMap is based on aerial photography; it is not accurate to a 1-2-foot measurement. Testimony of Maher Joudi. Project plans show the surveyed location of Allen Lake Outlet Channel. The critical area buffers are measured from that surveyed location. Testimony of Maher Joudi.
22. In response to Appellants' concerns regarding potential widening or migration of the Allen Lake Outlet Channel, Dr. McCarthy testified that Channel is a low gradient channel without a significant potential for erosion. That combined with the underlying glacial till soil, hard points such as culverts and road crossings, and the well-connected

floodplain which allows the Channel to overflow into the floodplain and riparian wetlands, limit the potential for channel migration. In addition, the Channel has been tested by two recent 50-year storms, one occurring in December 2019 and one in February 2020, and has remained stable. Testimony of Ed McCarthy.

23. The 100-year base flood elevation shown on Ex. T8-008 is based on Dr. McCarthy's Level 3 downstream analysis. The February 2020 storm event provides empirical data to back up his analysis. Testimony of Maher Joudi; Ex. T8-008.
24. Appellants expressed concerns regarding flooding downstream in the vicinity of NE 8th St. This topic is also outside of the scope of the SEPA appeal and is addressed in the companion Decision on the preliminary plat.
25. Appellants expressed concern that the County and Applicant had not looked at impacts of the Project holistically, in particular concerns about the Allen Lake Outlet Channel, wetland buffer averaging, and the proposed location of trail within the wetland buffer. Testimony of Shishir Abhyanker. However, the record before the Examiner demonstrates that the Applicant and Department did examine the interplay of these issues and the cumulative impacts of the entire Project (not only Lots 16-17) and six other recent projects in the vicinity on drainage, flooding, and erosion.

Access to Lots 16 and 17 Concerns

26. Lots 16 and 17 will gain access via NE 16th St. Exs. D1 and D6.
27. Appellants expressed concern for the safety of their friends and people who may be recreating in their rear yards. However, they offer no traffic assessment to demonstrate traffic safety risk with the driveway location or design. As explained in Finding 32 below, to meet the required driveway link a garage on Lot 17 must be set back at least 40 feet from the fence on Appellant Abhyanker's property. A garage on Lot 16 must be set back at least 20 feet from the fence on Appellant Das' property.
28. Appellants did not present any evidence on adverse noise impacts from the location of the driveway.

Aesthetics, Security, and Privacy

29. Appellants questioned whether the proposed density is consistent with the R-4 zone and the character of the area. Ex. A4-003; testimony Abinash Das and Shishir Abhyanker. While these issues are arguably outside of the scope of the SEPA appeal, the Examiner has addressed them in response to the aesthetics concerns raised in Issue D.
30. The area immediately east, north, and south of the Project, as well as Appellants' properties, is zoned R-4 and developed with single-family residences. Ex. D1-003-004.
31. Permitted density is based on gross acreage, which for the Project is 4.87 acres after completion of the BLA. The allowable density, based on 4 units/acre, is 19 units; 17

- units are proposed. KCC 21A.12.080.A; Exs. D1-004, D16; testimony of Kim Claussen and Jeff Peterson.
32. The average lot size within the proposed plat is 3,675 square feet and the density 3.49 dwelling units/acre. Ex. T8-002. Lot 16 is 5,480 square feet; Lot 17 is 4,448 square feet. While the average lot size in Woodhaven II is larger at 5,366 square feet, the density is greater at 5.78 dwelling units/acre. Woodhaven II used TDRs to achieve more than 4 units per acre. Ex. T16-001; testimony of Jeff Peterson. Appellant Abhyanker's lot is 5,000 square feet. Appellant Das' lot is 5,625 square feet.
33. Appellants' rear yards face the front yards of proposed Lots 16 and 17. A 20-foot wide sewer easement runs north and south along the joint property line between Appellants' properties and Lots 16 and 17. Lots 16 and 17 will be served by a joint use driveway in Tract D. Tract D is 20 feet wide and located on top of the sewer easement of the same width. The pavement width of the joint use driveway will be 18 feet.
- A. The front yard setback for a house on Lot 17 is 10 feet from Tract D, providing a separation of 36.4 feet from the rear of Appellant Abhyanker's house. The Lot 17 garage must be set back at least 20 feet from Tract D in order to provide the required driveway length of 20 feet. The garage will thus be 40 feet from the fence on Appellant Abhyanker's property.
- B. No structure can be located on top of the sewer easement. Consequently, a house on Lot 16 must be set back at least 20 feet from the property line, providing a separation of approximately 45 feet from the rear of Appellant Das' house. To provide an adequate turn radius, the garage will need to be set back an additional increment and will, thus, be more than 20 feet from the fence on Appellant Das' property. Exs. T8-015, T9-001, T12-001, and T13; testimony Jeff Peterson and Maher Joudi.
34. Access tracts are common in the vicinity and typically adjacent to or quite close to houses by which they pass. Testimony of Jeff Peterson.
35. Appellant Abhyanker testified that homes within the neighborhood are 80-100 feet apart. His testimony is not supported by the record. In support of this contention, he offered Ex. A5-002, which measured the distance from one of the homes in Woodhaven II across NE. 16th St. to a home located on the south side of NE. 16th St. A more pertinent measurement is the distance between homes in the plat in which Appellants reside. The Appellants' homes face 246th Pl. NE and have 5-foot side yards, creating a distance of 10 feet between the two homes. Exhibit T9-001.
36. Appellants expressed concern about the impact foot traffic using the trail may have on their privacy. Testimony of Shishir Abhyanker. As found above, the trail will be private and is intended to provide access from Lots 16 and 17 to Tract A. It may also provide a route for students residing in the Project to reach the elementary and middle schools.

37. Appellant Abhyanker expressed concern about loss of access in the rear rooms of his house to morning sun. Ex A5-002. This issue is well is outside of the scope of the SEPA appeal. Nor does the record demonstrate a significant impact. The Project is not only down gradient from his home, but also complies with required setbacks. One of the purposes of such setbacks is the maintenance of privacy between uses. Exs. A1-003-006, A2.7-001-002; A5-002, T13, T15-004; KCC 21A.12.010.
38. Any Finding of Fact which is more appropriately considered a Conclusion of Law is hereby adopted as a Conclusion of Law.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

1. Any Conclusion of Law which is more appropriately considered a Finding of Fact is hereby adopted as a Finding of Fact.
2. The scope of the SEPA appeal is limited to matters or issues raised in the appeal statement. KCC 20.22.080.G.
3. Appellant bears the burden of proving that the DNS is “clearly erroneous” based on the record as a whole. *Moss v. Bellingham*, 109 Wn. App. 6, 13, 31 P.3d 703 (2001) (citations omitted); Rule XV.E.1 of the Hearing Examiner’s Rules of Procedure and Mediation (Examiner’s Rules). Appellants may do so either by proving that the proposal will cause probable significant adverse impacts requiring an environmental impact statement or by proving that specific adverse environmental impacts have not been addressed by adopted regulations or other project mitigation. WAC 197-11-330-360, adopted by reference by KCC 20.44.040; KCC 20.44.080. A decision is clearly erroneous if, although there is evidence in the record to support it, the Hearing Examiner is “left with a definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been committed.” *Moss*, 109 Wn. App. at 6.
4. The standard of proof is a preponderance of the evidence. Examiner’s Rule XV.F.2.
5. The Hearing Examiner must accord the decision of the responsible official substantial weight. KCC 20.44.120.A.3, citing RCW 43.21C.075(3)(d).
6. The record contains technical analyses that are reasonably sufficient to evaluate the environmental impacts of the proposal. WAC 197-11-335.
7. The Appellants have not demonstrated that the Project results in specific adverse impacts not addressed by the regulations identified in KCC 20.44.080.C or that unusual circumstances exist.

DECISION:

1. The Appeals are **DENIED**.

DATED April 9, 2021.

Alison Moss
Hearing Examiner pro tem

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

King County Code 20.22.040 directs the Examiner to make the County's final decision for this type of case. This decision shall be final and conclusive unless proceedings for review of the decision are timely and properly commenced in superior court. Appeals are governed by the Land Use Petition Act, Chapter 36.70C RCW.

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 26, 2021, HEARING ON PRELIMINARY PLAT APPLICATION LEARY FLOYD ASSEMBLAGE AND SEPA APPEAL, DEPARTMENT OF LOCAL SERVICES FILE NO. PLAT190003, PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 2021-0076

Alison Moss was the Hearing Examiner in this matter. Participating in the hearing were Shishir Abhyanker, Laura Casey, Kimberly Claussen, Abinash Das, Jay Derr, Maher Joudi, Kolten Kusters, Edward McCarthy, Jeff Peterson, and Jeff Schramm.

The following exhibits were offered and entered into the hearing record by the Department:

- | | |
|----------------|---|
| Exhibit no. 1 | Preliminary department report, dated March 26, 2021 |
| Exhibit no. 2 | Land use permit application, received October 31, 2019 |
| Exhibit no. 3 | State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) checklist, received October 31, 2019 |
| Exhibit no. 4 | SEPA determination of non-significance, dated January 12, 2021 |
| Exhibit no. 5 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Affidavit of posting notice of plat application, posted on December 31, 2019 B. SEPA threshold determination, posted on December 22, 2020 C. Notice of recommendation and hearing, posted on February 26, 2021 |
| Exhibit no. 6 | Revised preliminary plat map, dated July 24, 2020 |
| Exhibit no. 7 | Assessors maps – NW 26-25-06 |
| Exhibit no. 8 | Revised preliminary TIR, by DR Strong, dated July 24, 2020 |
| Exhibit no. 9 | Traffic impact analysis (TIA) including school walkway and appendix D, by TENW, dated September 19, 2019 |
| Exhibit no. 10 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Raedeke Assoc., wetland delineation, dated April 18, 2019 |

- B. Raedeke Assoc., Technical Memo (buffer averaging), dated October 21, 2019
- C. Raedeke Assoc., response memo (buffer and wildlife), dated June 30, 2020
- D. Raedeke Assoc., Technical Memo, dated July 22, 2020
- Exhibit no. 11 Geotechnical Report by Associated Earth Sciences, dated June 25, 2019
- Exhibit no. 12 McCarthy Technical Memo (downstream flood), dated June 15, 2020
- Exhibit no. 13 McCarthy Level 3 Downstream Analysis, dated July 22, 2020
- Exhibit no. 14 Critical Areas Designation CADS19-0039, dated April 25, 2019
- Exhibit no. 15 KC GIS zoning map (vicinity)
- Exhibit no. 16 Residential Density Worksheet, received October 31, 2019
- Exhibit no. 17 Public Comments
 - A. Husting
 - B. Debusk
 - C. Martin
- Exhibit no. 18 Certificate of water availability, by Samm. Plateau Water & Sewer, dated September 10, 2019
- Exhibit no. 19 Fire district receipt, dated September 17, 2019
- Exhibit no. 20 SEPA Appeals, received February 4, 2021
 - A. Abinash Das
 - B. Shishir Abhyanker and Shipra Kulkarni
- Exhibit no. 21 Witness list, dated March 12, 2021
- Exhibit no. 22 Email with corrections from Kimberly Claussen, submitted March 26, 2021

The following exhibits were offered and entered into the hearing record by the Applicants:

- Exhibit no. T1. Applicant Toll Bros., Inc.’s prehearing statement
- Exhibit no. T2. Jeffrey C. Peterson resume
- Exhibit no. T3. Maher A. Joudi P.E. resume
- Exhibit no. T4. Jeff Schramm resume
- Exhibit no. T5. Kurt D. Merriman, P.E. resume
- Exhibit no. T6. Kolten Kosters, M.S. PWS statement of qualifications
- Exhibit no. T7. Edward J. McCarthy resume
- Exhibit no. T8. Toll Presentation (Plat presentation slides)
- Exhibit no. T9. Appellant Plot Plans (plot plans showing location of appellants homes and our setbacks)
- Exhibit no. T10. Floyd Leary Trail (shows trail layout mentioned in hearing examiners report. Replaces C3)
- Exhibit no. T11. GIS photo (2019 GIS photo showing site and surrounding features)
- Exhibit no. T12. Google Earth lots 16-17 (shows post-construction condition of appellants lots)
- Exhibit no. T13. Grading and Setbacks Sketchup 16-17 (Sketchup 3-d look at future conditions and setbacks)
- Exhibit no. T14. Updated Mitigation Plan (response to tribe comment in SEPA)
- Exhibit no. T15. Photographs

- A. Feb 2020 18th Culvert
 - B. Feb 2020 East Property Line
 - C. Looking NE toward lot 17
 - D. Looking NW from lot 17 SW corner
 - E. Looking West from lot 17 SW corner
 - F. Looking West on 18th
- Exhibit no. T16. Preliminary Plat Approved Set from January 28, 2015, submitted March 26, 2021

The following exhibits were offered and entered into the hearing record by the Appellants:

- Exhibit no. A1 Email and photographs by Abinash Das, sent March 8, 2021
- Exhibit no. A2.1 Districts and Development Conditions for 3 parcels
- Exhibit no. A2.2 Allen Lake outlet stream recon, dated December 2012
- Exhibit no. A2.3 Allen Lake Tech Memo
- Exhibit no. A2.4 Husting comments – Environment
- Exhibit no. A2.5 Husting comments - Density
- Exhibit no. A2.6 Husting comments – Traffic
- Exhibit no. A2.7 Photographs of proposed property line
- Exhibit no. A3 Rebuttal letter, emailed March 19, 2021
- Exhibit no. A4 Environment, wetland, and flooding
- Exhibit no. A5 Aesthetic privacy and safety
- Exhibit no. A6 CADS affidavit
- Exhibit no. A7 Allen Lake channel flooding, drainage, and corrosion complaints
- Exhibit no. A8 Map of flooding and drainage complaints

April 9, 2021

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

King County Courthouse
516 Third Avenue Room 1200
Seattle, Washington 98104
Telephone (206) 477-0860
hearingexaminer@kingcounty.gov
www.kingcounty.gov/independent/hearing-examiner

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

SUBJECT: Department of Local Services file no. **PLAT190003**
Proposed ordinance no.: **2021-0076**

LEARY FLOYD ASSEMBLAGE
SEPA Threshold Determination Appeal

I, Jessica Oscoy, certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that I transmitted the **REPORT AND DECISION** to those listed on the attached page as follows:

EMAILED to all County staff listed as parties/interested persons and parties with e-mail addresses on record.

placed with the United States Postal Service, with sufficient postage, as FIRST CLASS MAIL in an envelope addressed to the non-County employee parties/interested persons to addresses on record.

DATED April 9, 2021.



Jessica Oscoy
Office Manager

Abhyanker/Kulkarni, Shishir/Shipra
Hardcopy

Casey, Laura
Department of Local Services

Claussen, Kimberly
Department of Local Services

Das, Abinash
Hardcopy

DeBusk, GERALYN & JOHN
Hardcopy

Derr, Jay
Van Ness Feldman
Hardcopy

Eichelsdoerfer, Robert
Department of Local Services

Floyd, Hank and Tami
Hardcopy

Howard, Hal & Donna
Hardcopy

Husting, Jennifer/Pat
Hardcopy

Joudi, Maher
DR Strong Consulting Engineers Inc
Hardcopy

Kosters, Kolten

Martin, Scott & Barbara
Hardcopy

McCarthy, Edward

Meins, Mike
Department of Local Services

Middleton, Zak/Kimberley
Hardcopy

Pedroza, Melani
Metropolitan King County Council

Peterson, Jeff
Toll Brothers, Inc
Hardcopy

Schramm, Jeff
Transportation Engineering NorthWest

Smith, Scott-DLSP
Department of Local Services

Stillwell, Jacob

Tiedeman, Talra
Hardcopy

Tiedeman, Wade/Anke
Hardcopy

Toll Brothers, Inc