

Rose Hill Heights South Sewer Plan Amendment L120162; L120405 SEPA - Exhibit List

In support of Rob's letter: #1 - Technical Committee's claim that the proposal would "put drinking water lines at risk" is pure hyperbole and based on an incorrect depth of the 24" water main.

Ex	Description	Relevant	Implication
Ex1	record as-built map water dis 81, dated 3-1-1983, by Gardner Eng.	Draws in <u>absolute accuracy</u> the depth of the 24" water main line along its rout on 132 nd , at depth of 7.2 to 8.1' feet deep. This info was also included in an NBE report on May-4-2009 submitted to the city of Redmond (CoR)	The diagram titled "Utility Profile for 132nd Avenue NE" on page 6 of the Technical Committee (TC) Report that shows the 24" water main at a depth of only 4' is clearly inaccurate and misleading, yet record was available to CoR
Ex36	CoR Design Requirements Jan-2012 specifics of sewer main p.19-22	<u>"The minimum cover over ductile iron sewer mains is three (3) feet", "minimum cover over other sewer mains is five (5) feet" (changed by CoR in 2011), "The preferred cover over sewer mains is seven (7) feet..."</u> , "Manholes are to be installed at a <u>maximum of 350-foot spacing</u> ", "Minimum slopes on main lines are: 8" = 0.0050 ft./ft", "WA State Department of Ecology, regarding water main/sanitary sewer vertical clearance shall be followed"	Kirkland sewer line is per standard, ductile iron sewer main line at 3' depth is per standard, crossing the street is feasible. Contradictory to CoR statements
Ex3	email by Nick Bossoff engineer to Bob Franklin	Regarding crossing the water lines: <u>"Tom Chriest who was the inspector for the side sewer installation at Lot 15. He did not remember any significant difficulties in crossing the water main..."</u>	No issues are known with existing sewer crossing. TC alarm is false.
Ex4	emails by Bob Franklin June 02, 2009	water line depth info received from Kirkland: <u>"the 5-foot depth appears to be fairly accurate"</u> , also <u>"I would consider the five-foot depth to be reasonably sufficient at NE 73rd Street"</u>	Bob Franklin CoR Public Works Engineering Manager confirms water line depth do not pose an issue. Contradictory to CoR current statements
Ex5	Sewer Service Analysis by NBE May 5 th , 2009	Showing four <u>cross sections and utilities depth on 132nd and existing sewer line connections</u> (full size copy will be submitted to the planning committee). The report was expanded to include the 70-73 rd streets section per Bob franklin request	Record is clear about the street sections for the entire street portion, crossing is feasible and has been done several times before, CoR had the info since 2009. In contradiction to depth info provided by TC.
Ex32	City of Kirkland (CoK) Emergency Sewer Program, web page	<u>"Construct new sewer main to provide connections for aging septic systems, protect land, water and property values"</u> <u>"Septic systems are intended to be a short-term solution for handling wastewater with an expected life of roughly 30 years."</u>	In contract to CoR lack of action plan and TC report p.2 (TC page 2). South rose hill area is not part of CoR future plan. The south rosehill septic systems are about 60 years old – double than the 30 years life expectancy. Contradicts TC

		<i>In order to provide long-term benefits of sanitary sewer to hazardous septic system situations, the City developed the Emergency Sewer Program in 1999". In its phase 1 CoK provided 458 connections to properties on septic systems in Kirkland.</i>	stance that that connecting to Kirkland sewer now creates a "creating a public safety hazard" if anything keeping Redmond properties on septic is the hazard
--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

In simple words: the CoR fiercely resists allowing for an easily and available sewer connection of Redmond properties on 132nd to an existing and fully functional Kirkland sewer line. On the other hand has no foreseeable plan to serve this area on its own. To maintain control the CoR Public Works will danger the environment, damage and prevent development from its residence and from itself.

In support of #2 - Technical Committee Report gives false impression of Redmond's utility design requirements.

Ex11	<i>COK engineering detail for Shallow Manhole Assembly COK</i>	<i>shows that sewer manhole can be up to 4' deep</i>	<i>The sewer manholes on Kirkland sewer line are meeting the standard.). In contradiction to the CoR claims that CoK sewer line does not meet standards</i>
Ex12	<i>COK engineering detail for Extra Shallow Manhole Assembly</i>	<i>allows for even shallow 31" deep sewer manhole</i>	<i>In support of Ex11.</i>

In support of #3 - Use of the Kirkland sewer main as proposed is feasible.

Ex25 & Ex26 & Ex27 & Ex28	emails from Rob Jammerman - Kirkland's Development and Environmental Services Engineering Manager	<i>"I spoke with Bob at Redmond this morning and told him that <u>Kirkland could serve your project.</u>", re <u>reliability of existing connections</u>: "No issues that I'm aware of", and "I'm double checking with our utility engineers to make sure we have no <u>capacity issues in this sewer basin; I've never heard of any.</u>", "If Redmond contacts me and requests that Kirkland consider providing sewer to your property, we will start the process to be sure we have capacity.", "I assume that <u>Kirkland and Redmond will handle this with an Inter-local Agreement.</u> If possible I'd like the entire common boundary so that properties can be served by either City where agreed upon and where appropriate", "<u>we'd be willing to allow this if Redmond is willing to and if it is the only feasible option</u>"</i>	<i>Kirkland was closely engaged with Redmond regarding connection feasibility, Kirkland confirms the connection is feasible, Kirkland line has been working flawlessly, including Redmond connections, Kirkland is willing to allow new Redmond connection, and is willing to enter into an inter-local agreement for that purpose.</i>
Ex30 & Ex40	As built for exciting Redmond homes connections to Kirkland	7040 132 nd Ave NE, and 13202 NE 70 th St are connected since 2002-2003	If it connects and works since July-2002 where are feasibility arguments?

Ex23	Inter-local agreement between Kirtland and Redmond dates Feb-2011	Serve the Coptic Church on 132 nd by CoR sewer line.	<u>inter-local agreements are achievable</u> if not common
see Ex34 & Ex 35	Staff report in regard to the application for sewer service outside city limits for St. George Coptic orthodox church	TC recommending to: <i>“Deny the request for sewer”</i> . In its staff report says:” <i>“Staff does <u>not find that approving the request is in the best interest of the City or consistent with Redmond policy. Staff believes that approval of the request would be considered by property owners and residents in NE Rose Hill to be a change in Redmond’s procedure with respect to allowing sewer connections to unincorporated areas. In addition, it would set a precedent for future requests for sewer connection outside City limits, and although TC report page 7 “the existing City of Kirkland sewer adjacent to the church is 10-12 feet deep – much deeper than the line adjacent to the applicant’s property”, “Staff recommends denial of the request...”</u></i> , Yet Redmond city council approve the new connection !	CoR Public Works has history of resistance to sewer service by other cities regardless of the feasibility or policy to do so, it takes a political stance over stepping technical and long terms city goals.PW recognized that connecting the Church is a precedent to future connections, and has no basis to deny rosehill.

In support of # 4 - Technical Committee had conceptually approved use of the Kirkland sewer main.

Ex21, Ex22	emails involving Nick Bossoff engineer, Cor PW and planning spring 2009	discussion on sewer service option, and process	the reports analysis were <u>joint effort</u> with CoR involvement to establish feasibility and priority for sewer service to the area
Ex29	NBE Sewer Feasibility report March-2009		Submitted to the CoR
Ex7	CoR Technical committee agenda dated April 1 st , 2009	Presentation by Bob Franklin to the TC of the four alternatives for service to the rosehill south area (see Ex8), also asking for Kirkland willingness and capacity to serve. These were answered positively by the next meeting	Option C was selected - same as the subject comprehensive plan change proposal
Ex18 & Ex19	interoffice memo to TC by Bob Franklin to TC dated 4-1-2009	Discuss the four option for sewer service to the area, not recommending option 2 and 4 and <u>preferring option 3</u> (the subject change) over 4 – both 3 and 4 involve service by Kirkland. The CoR planner Jeff Churchill in response to review of the memo wrote: <i>“Short and to the point...looks good to me...”</i>	Full analysis for the sewer service to the area already made in 2009 and connection to Kirkland preferred
Ex8	Technical committee presentation by Bob Franklin dated April 1 st , 2009	reviews the four alternative to serve sewer to the area states <i>“Recently annexed – now eligible for sewer”, <u>Alt 1 the current city plan “Double sewer in 132nd \$534k” Alt 3 proposed “7 served by CoR extension, 9 by existing Co, Deeper sewer, \$400k”</u></i> , cites UT-28 and UT-29 (see Ex9) policies, and states that Redmond <u>“Facilities</u>	IN continuation of above. CoR public works fully aware of the options in details.

		<u>insufficient to accommodate growth</u>	
Ex2	email by Bob Franklin (CoR Public Works Engineering Manager) April 28, 2009	–, re the technical committee presentation on the sewer connection to Kirkland and its position on capacity : <u>“The Technical Committee meeting went fine...that sewer capacity is not seen as any problem from Rob Jammerman’s perspective... the next step was the detailed engineering crosssections from your engineer.”</u> Bob also commented on discussion with Kirkland and their position: <u>“I spoke with Rob Jammerman at Kirkland this morning. He is confident that there are no problems with sewer capacity in the sub-basin containing your site”</u>	Confirm TC was presented, Kirkland is in Support and next steps in feasibility agreed.
Ex6	Technical committee agenda dated April 22 nd , 2009	Determines: <u>“Can be served by Kirkland sewer. need interlocal with Kirkland.”</u>	TC approved the plan
Ex9	Attachment D: City of Redmond Comprehensive Plan Sewer Policies	<u>“Extend a waiver in limited circumstances where the economic impact of connection is high and there is no public safety concern.”</u>	
Ex10	Kirkland sewer map for 132 nd	The spacing of the man holes are less than 350’ (as required). This is	Kirkland sewer line does meet standards

In support of # 5 - Technical Committee Report egregiously misstates facts regarding slopes on the properties: Elevation rises to the east.

Ex16	– Topographic survey by Mead Gilman dated 8-6-2007	Showing two lots 7300-7306 132 nd Ave NE, clearly has a <u>10’ decline from east to west, toward 132nd</u> . The decline is consistent along the properties between 70 th and 73 rd .	In contrast to the technical report stating that the elevations of the lots: "fall-off to the east, making this task difficult." (TC Report at 5).
Ex17	CoR GIS maps database	<u>Showing elevation decline to the west. yet</u> In the planning committee session on Nov 14 th the planner responded that the TC report misstatement about the elevations <u>“fall of to the east”</u> was result of mismatch with the city GIS maps, yet unfortunately the GIS maps do show about a <u>10’ decline to the west (from 470’ to 460’)</u> .	If the city staff knew that the elevation indeed decline to the west in support of servicing sewer by gravity for the area, and stated otherwise then this is a serious intent to intentionally misleading to planning committee. If the city were not aware of the info that is ready available on their GIS system, then they have done very poor work in preparation of the TC report, and failed their continuous position against the sewer connection feasibility

In support of # 6 - Proposed amendment is positive for the entire unserved subarea, and does not delay access to sewer service

<p>Ex14 & Ex15 & Ex38</p>	<p>NAHB report: The Local Impact of Home Building in a Typical Metro Area, Comparing Costs to Revenue for Local Governments, June 2009</p>	<p>Shows: a typical 100 homes build “after 15 years, the homes will generate a cumulative \$20.4 million in revenue compared to only \$10.4 million in costs, including annual current expenses, capital investment, and interest on debt” a net of \$10.0M, or prorated to the subject proposal area <u>\$3M net income to the municipality.</u></p> <p>Additionally “In the first year, 100 single-family homes built in a typical metro area result in an Estimated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$28.3 million in local income • \$4.3 million in taxes and other revenue for local governments • 317 local jobs.... <p>The annual recurring impacts of building 100 single-family homes in our two-county area include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$4 million in local income • \$1.1 million in taxes and other revenue for local governments • 50 local jobs 	<p>This clearly contradicts TC pp.14: “<i>in general, <u>single-family homes are more-or-less a wash in terms of property tax collected vs. service provided...</u></i>” and grossly ignores the immediate benefits to the local economy. This position is in contrast to any city responsibility for its residence protection and prosperity. If the city doesn’t need its residence why it was celebrating the annexation?</p>
-------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

In support of# 9 - Kensington and Northstar differ from South Rose Hill infill development.

<p>Ex36</p>	<p>North Star development</p>	<p>North Star has 133 lots. See page 5 on attached list of projects.</p>	<p>TC compared 133 units extending 3700LF (TC p.7) to 6 units extending 900LF is of course out of proposition (by x5.5 factor)</p>
-------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Other Exhibits demonstrates the city changing policies

<p>Ex19</p>	<p>internal email by CoR planner Lori Peckol 9/19/2008</p>	<p>confirms the CoR staff told rosehill neighbors before annexation that sewer service from Kirkland may be possible after annexation: “<i>we said Kirkland has a sewer line in part of 132nd, <u>some property owners may be able to connect after annexation depending on the depth of the line, location of other utilities, topo to the homes,</u></i></p>	<p>While the city has conditioned the sewer connection to be post annexation, the city now presents an opposition to allowing properties</p>
-------------	------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<i>etc...." sewer availability was a main motivation to south rose hill 26 acres annexation (52 properties</i>	connect to sewer post annexation.
Ex20	email by Jim Streit CoR engineer March 9 th , 2011	<i>"The Public Works Director informed me that he never agreed to change the General Sewer Plan to allow you or anyone else to connect to the City of Kirkland sanitary main." It also claims that the Kirkland sewer line is below standard and was not designed: "Kirkland's sanitary main in 132nd Avenue NE has manholes sporadically spaced... indicating there was no real plan for this sewer".</i>	The Public works denies after the fact that there was joint and agreeable work on sewer plan change, and claims Kirkland sewer is not built per standard. Both false claims.
Ex24	email between CoK and CoR May-2009	A discussion between the cities on as-built info for 132 nd .	This contradicts CoR denial in the planning committee itself that such discussion between the cities ever took place.
Ex31	Kirkland GIS data map	Shows proximity of sewer line to Coptic Church and south rose hill properties (sewer at the street), both with no Redmond sewer available within 250' range.	250' in King county is maximum distance to available sewer, to require a property with septic to connect sewer
Ex33	email by CoR July- 2009	Confirms that Redmond properties were allowed to connect to other cities sewer: <i>"Redmond allowed two existing houses at NE 124th Street to connect to Woodinville Water District's sewer..."</i>	this is in contradiction to the staff testimony at the planning committee meeting that such connection to other municipalities were ever allowed by the CoR

These exhibits provide evidence that the TC report and staff responses during the planning committee were false. The evidence clearly contradicts the city statements, and proves that:

- A connection to Kirkland is feasible
- That the CoK sewer has the capacity and is per standard, and has functioned flawlessly, including existing Redmond connections.
- That inter-local agreement between the cities is common and achievable (contradicts TC p.5 *"It is not known whether acceptable terms could be established"*)
- That Kirkland is willing and cooperative in achieving such inter-local agreement
- That Redmond allowed such connections before
- That there was a specific discussion on the sewer connection with the city of Kirkland
- That there was a promise and intent to allow for such a connection, this was actually approved by TC in 2009 following the analysis
- That specific cost estimation for the various options is available, and that the proposed plan change would 'cost more' money and time
- That technical information is available - those same staff members, some testified in this committee and TC report, were involved at the 2008-9 work on the sewer plan change for that area, and were exposed and aware to all this record before.