

March 25, 1996

OFFICE OF THE HEARING EXAMINER
KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON
700 Central Building
810 Third Avenue
Seattle, Washington 98104

DECISION ON SHORELINE SUBSTANTIAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT APPLICATION.

SUBJECT: Department of Development and Environmental Services File No. **L95SH019**

Shoreline Substantial Development Permit Application Submitted for:
Preliminary Plats of
**CHRYSLIS ESTATES (No. S90P0028); WEBERS RIDGE (No. S90P0096);
and OLD MILL POINT (S90P0105)**

Shoreline development to be located on the western slope of the Sammamish Plateau,
approximately one mile south of the Sammamish River outlet from Lake Sammamish

PRELIMINARY REPORT:

The Department of Development and Environmental Services land Use Services Division's Preliminary Report on Item L95SH019 was received by the Examiner on January 22, 1996.

PUBLIC HEARING:

In conjunction with reviewing the Land Use Services Division's Report, examining available information on file with the application, and visiting the site and surrounding area the Examiner conducted a public hearing on the subject as follows:

The hearing on Item No. L95SH019 was opened by the Examiner at 9:18 a.m., February 5, 1996, in Hearing Room No. 2, Department of Development and Environmental Services, 3600 - 136th Place S.E., Suite A, Bellevue, Washington, and adjourned at 4:40 p.m. Subsequent hearings were held as follows:

DATE	PLACE	OPEN	ADJOURN/ CLOSE
2-6-96	Hearing Room 2	9:20 AM	4:52 PM
2-7-96	Hearing Room 2	11:08 AM	5:10 PM
2-8-96	Hearing Room 2	9:25 AM	11:45 AM
2-9-96	Hearing Room 2	9:20 AM	4:42 PM

The public hearing on this application was administratively continued for 30 days to allow for publication of notice and public comment.

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.

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

FINDINGS:

1. General Information:
- Shoreline Designation:

Shoreline Water Body:

Location:

Proposed Shoreline Use:

Conservancy

Lake Sammamish

The development is to be generally located on the western slope of the Sammamish Plateau, approximately one mile south of the Sammamish River outlet from Lake Sammamish

Installation of a surface-laid tightline stormwater drainage system and associated appurtenances, with an outfall to Lake Sammamish

2. Except as modified herein, the facts and conclusions set forth in the King County Land Use Services Division's preliminary report to the King County Hearing Examiner for the February 5, 1996, public hearing are found to be correct and are incorporated herein by reference. The LUSD staff recommends approval of the application, subject to conditions.
3. The three contiguous subdivision applications for Chrysalis Estates, Webbers Ridge and Old Mill Point were consolidated into a single review process before the King County Hearing Examiner for consideration of the three preliminary plat applications plus the instant shoreline substantial development permit. Public hearings on the consolidated applications were held on February 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9, 1996. However, a defect in the public notice for the shoreline permit application was identified at the hearing and a new notice required to be published. This has resulted in a delay of the shoreline decision in order to accommodate a new 30-day comment period. Submittals received during the comment period have been included herein as exhibits.
4. The proponents propose to install a single surface water drainage system featuring a surface-laid tightline from the three plats to an outfall within Lake Sammamish, a shoreline of state-wide significance. The Applicants plan to construct within the Lake Sammamish "Conservancy" shoreline environment pipes, culverts, catch basins, a swale, an energy dissipator, and an outfall terminating at the 100-year floodplain elevation. The outfall will be constructed with a rock pad and bioengineered downstream within the flow channel. These proposed shoreline developments and the regulations and policies applicable to them are discussed within the LUSD staff report.
5. At the public hearings held on this application issues were raised by a shoreline property owner to the south, Robert Hamilton, concerning the construction, operation and maintenance of the conveyance and outfall system. Mr. Hamilton owns a residential lot along the Lake Sammamish shoreline lying approximately 400 feet south of the proposed outfall location. However, the tightline which leads to the outfall will approach from the south and in its southernmost extension is directly uphill from Mr. Hamilton's property.
6. Mr. Hamilton, through his engineer, has communicated concerns about the potential for stormwater overflow onto his property if the proposed conveyance system malfunctions. In response to Mr. Hamilton's concerns, the Applicant has agreed to replace the open ditch above the outfall with an enclosed pipe, to divert flows from culvert No. 5 lying up-gradient from Mr. Hamilton's residence, and to plug the culvert. These design alterations are included in Condition No. 25.
7. In addition, Mr. Hamilton has argued for a condition requiring extension of the rock pad at the mouth of the outfall a further 50 feet down to the ordinary high water mark. The staff conditions, as proposed, require a 12-foot extension of rip rap from the mouth of the outfall and the downstream channel to be bioengineered. Mr. Hamilton has offered a number of arguments in favor of extending the riprap to the ordinary high water mark, including the possibility that soils saturation below the outfall pad will destabilize trees which may fall across the joint use access driveway to his property, or that sediment buildup at the mouth of the outfall may redirect flows south towards his property boundary.
8. We have been presented with no credible evidence that either saturation risks or sediment buildup at the mouth of the outfall are likely to occur or to adversely affect Mr. Hamilton's property. The record demonstrates that the outfall pad will extend to the point where flow velocities dissipate to a non-erosive level. At the location where flows become non-erosive potential risks to the stability of existing large trees should be eliminated as well. Accordingly, no further conditions requiring the protection of vegetation are warranted.
9. Finally, Mr. Hamilton seeks to have the Applicants upgrade the access road which serves both the proposed drainage facilities and his shoreline property. Because the access road entry runs parallel to East Sammamish Parkway, Mr. Hamilton's engineer has pointed out that construction equipment and maintenance trucks entering from or exiting to the south will have an inadequate radius to complete the turn without crossing into the opposing lane. Mr. Hamilton's attorney has suggested that the Applicants be required to increase the turning radius by providing a turnout approach along East Lake Sammamish Parkway. In addition, Mr. Hill, Mr. Hamilton's engineer, has argued that the existing 10-foot wide gravel driveway be widened to 12 or 15 feet and surfaced with asphalt in order to support the Applicant's construction and maintenance use.
10. We do not agree with Mr. Hamilton that the use proposed by these applicants justifies the level of road improvement suggested. Subsequent to construction, the drainage outfall facilities will only require occasional inspection and maintenance. A more reasonable response to turning radius issues is simply to require large vehicles to approach and exit to the north, the direction which the entrance faces and also the most convenient arterial access route. Further, we do not find that the requirements of the Surface Water Design Manual relating to construction of drainage pond roads apply to the access for an offsite conveyance facility. However, a bond should be required to repair damage to the access road if harm results from the Applicant's construction activities. Conditions responsive to the matters discussed herein have been added to the decision.

CONCLUSIONS:

1. The shoreline development proposed for the plats' drainage tightline and outfall system, as mitigated by the conditions stated below, is consistent with the policy of the Shoreline Management Act as implemented by the Department of Ecology regulations. Such development also complies with the requirements of Chapter 25 of the King County Code and is consistent with the goals, policies, and objectives of the King County Shoreline Master Program.

DECISION:

Shoreline Substantial Development Permit ("SSDP") No. L95SH019 is **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. Nothing in this permit shall be construed as excusing the applicant from compliance with any federal, state, or local statutes, ordinances, or regulations applicable to this project other than the permit requirements of the Shoreline Management Act of 1971.
2. This permit may be rescinded pursuant to Section 14(7) of the Shoreline Management Act of 1971 in the event the permittee fails to comply with any conditions thereof.
3. Construction pursuant to this permit may not begin or be authorized until twenty-one (21) days from the date of filing the final order of King County with the Department of Ecology or the Attorney General; or until all review proceedings initiated within twenty-one (21) days from the date of such filing have been terminated.
4. **TIME REQUIREMENTS OF THE PERMIT.** The following requirements shall apply to all permits.
 - a. Substantial progress toward completion of a permitted activity shall be undertaken within two years after the approval of the permit by the Department of Development and Environmental Services (DDES). Substantial progress shall include all of the following, where applicable: The making of contracts; signing of notice to proceed; completion of grading and excavation; and the laying of major utilities; or, where no construction is involved, commencement of the activities. DDES may, at the request of the applicant, authorize a single extension for up to one year PROVIDED such request is made in writing at least 90 days prior to the expiration date.
 - b. Permit authorization shall terminate within five years after approval of the permit by DDES, except as modified by 4(a) above, in which case permit authorization may encompass up to a total of six years.
 - c. The permit time period shall not include the time during which an activity was not actually pursued due to the pendency of reasonably related administrative appeals or litigation.
 - d. DDES may issue permits with a fixed termination date for less than five years.
 - e. When permit approval is based on conditions, such conditions shall be satisfied prior to occupancy or use of a structure, or prior to commencement of a non- structural activity, unless otherwise stated in these conditions.
5. Development shall occur in accordance with the revised shoreline plans received **January 12, 1996**, appearing as **Exhibit D-7-a** in the shoreline file, EXCEPT as may be modified by conditions of approval. (Minor changes to this plan may be considered.) Any subsequent changes to the approved shoreline plans may require the applicant to obtain a new shoreline permit or a revision to this shore- line permit pursuant to WAC 173-14-064.
6. Copies of other approved State and Federal permits from the Department of Fish and Wildlife (HPA), Army Corps of Engineers, Department of Natural Resources (Aquatics Lands), Department of Ecology (Water Quality Standards Modification), and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), if necessary, shall be submitted to LUSD - Shorelines prior to construction.
7. The applicant shall obtain a clearing and grading permit from LUSD prior to construction. All conditions of the grading permit shall be considered conditions of this shoreline permit. Furthermore, applicable conditions of approval for the preliminary plats shall also be considered conditions of the SSDP.
8. Excavations for the drain line installation shall include precautions to prevent the migration of fine-grain sediments disturbed by the excavation onto adjacent beach areas. Any excavation on beach areas shall be backfilled promptly using material of similar composition.
9. A detailed revegetation plan shall be submitted by the applicant for review and approval by LUSD prior to issuance of the grading permit. The plan shall include the following items:

- a. A vegetation survey shall be performed by a qualified arborist.
 - b. The large deciduous trees in the utility easement shall be replaced with similar species.
 - c. Predominantly native species shall be used for revegetation within the lake buffer.
 - d. A variation of tree sizes at time of planting to contribute to a more natural appearance shall be required.
 - e. The plan shall indicate the protection of the designated trees to remain during construction with an approved tree fencing material around the drip line of these trees.
 - f. The revegetation plan shall require the developer to make a bona fide effort to preserve during drainage pipe installation any large deciduous trees growing within the easement. No topped, severely pruned, or weakened trees shall be retained.
10. A three-year maintenance bond shall be established as part of the grading permit application to ensure the successful establishment of vegetation and shall be released only upon demonstration to LUSD - Shorelines that said vegetation has been established.
11. A bioengineering plan for the rock outfall pad shall be submitted by the applicant for review and approval by LUSD prior to issuance of the grading permit. Native species plantings shall be included which will adequately cover the structure and survive in a saturated soil/substrate environment. Consistent with Section 4.3.7 of the Surface Water Management Manual, the rock outfall pad shall extend waterward toward the ordinary high water mark a distance sufficient to avoid flow velocities which will erode the bioengineered channel.
12. The applicant shall develop and demonstrate compliance with the implementation monitoring program recommended by the Water Quality Engineer ("WQE"), as outlined in the staff report on pages 42-43, prior to any construction and final approval of the grading permit. At a minimum, the WQE recommends:
 - a. The proper type and depth of sand shall be provided in the sand filter;
 - b. The invert elevations of inflow and outflow pipes to the water quality facility shall be installed as designed and verified by survey;
 - c. The flow split facilities to deliver the design storm (2/3 of the 2-year, 24 hour flow) to the water quality facilities and the remainder to the diversion dam/tightline shall be designed, constructed, and operating properly; and,
 - d. The control structure for the wetpond, including any outlet valves, shall ensure a wetpool remains in the pond between storms.
13. Shoreline conditions shall be shown on the final road and drainage plans prior to LUSD approval.
14. A copy of the approved shoreline plans and any necessary revisions shall be kept on-site at all times during construction.
15. No shoreline development is authorized within the 100-year floodplain or below the OHWM, other than the installation of erosion protection methods, storm drainage pipe, and revegetation as shown on the approved plans.
16. A copy of the approved HPA shall be submitted to LUSD - Shorelines prior to the drainage outfall construction or engineering plan approval.
17. Work within Shorelines jurisdiction shall be done in a manner to minimize disturbance. Extreme care shall be taken during construction to eliminate dispersal of any debris in the lake, or unnecessary site disturbance or vegetation removal.
18. Every effort shall be made to minimize the removal or disturbance of existing vegetation areas. All areas disturbed shall be restored immediately following completion of construction to its original condition as close as possible. The applicant shall maintain access to adjacent properties during and after construction.
19. During construction, the applicant must use materials and construction methods which prevent toxic materials, petro- chemicals, and other pollutants from entering the surface waters of Lake Sammamish.
20. Beach material shall not be used as backfill except as may be displaced by excavation for the storm drain line construction.

21. The applicant shall implement preventive measures for protecting existing storm drainage systems, ditches, and all other existing utilities and shall be responsible for them during construction activities.
22. A notice of completion of the drain line installation shall be submitted to LUSD - Shorelines by the developer within ten (10) calendar days. Said notice shall be accompanied by at least four (4) photographs of the finished work taken from different directions.
23. Prior to issuance of the grading permit, the applicant shall secure all construction easements and/or permits necessary for work within the Burlington Northern and County Road rights-of-way.
24. Flexibility under the subject SSDP shall be permitted to upsize the storm drainage pipe as needed during final drainage review to provide a higher factor of safety.
25. The proposed stormwater system shown on Exhibit D-7-a shall be revised to include the following design requirements:
 - a. Replace the ditch between outfalls 2A and 6A with a pipe in order to provide a continuous enclosed conveyance to the shoreline outfall; and,
 - b. Provide a storm drain stubout from proposed CB8 to receive flows which now go to existing culvert 5. Plug and abandon culvert No. 5.
26. In order to provide safe and adequate road access to drainage facilities within the shoreline area, the following are required:
 - a. Due to turning radius constraints at the access road intersection with East Lake Sammamish Parkway, all construction and maintenance vehicles shall enter from and exit toward the north; and,
 - b. Prior to the commencement of construction within shoreline jurisdiction, a bond shall be posted in an amount determined by LUSD for the repair of potential damage to the access road. After construction is completed any necessary repairs shall be made (as reviewed and approved by LUSD) prior to release of the bond.

ORDERED this 25th day of March, 1996.

Stafford L. Smith, Deputy
King County Hearing Examiner

TRANSMITTED this 25th day of March, 1996, to the following parties and interested persons:

Thomas Aitchison
Bill & Jan Armstrong
Dick & Donna Auby
Tom & Carol Bason
Larry & Gail Bazzell
Bellevue Planning Dept.
Yetta Bennett
Blane & Christi Berry
Ron & Tory Bezzant
Edward & Cheryl Bondy
Edward M. Boyd
David & Monika Bruner
Joanna Buehler
Jim & Kathy Captain
Jay & Bev Carpenter
Barbara & Robert Carr
Ken & Lana Childs
Jeff & Joanie Chinn
Donald & Barbara Coyner
B. Creager/Barghausen
Brad & Diane Cvetovich
Craig Dagleish
Tom & Sharon Danner
Dan & Colleen Davis

John Davis
Brian & Keily Derrick
Mike & Cathy Dibello
Donna Dixon
Roger Dorstad
Gretchen Duque
Joy & Loretta Esser
Jack Estep
Fire Protection Dist. #34
Freed/Zachary
Luke & Marlene Fu
Charles & Irene Fung
Dick Gardner
John & Joyce Garland
Ben & Sharon Gay
Mike & Ilana Golan
Linda Gorremans
Karen Goswell
Charles Grimes
Group Four
Patricia & James Groves
Harry Grzelewski
C. Guillou
Ellen Gullholm

**CHRYSLIS ESTATES, WEBERS RIDGE & OLD MILL POINT
SHORELINE SUBSTANTIAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT APP.**

Page - 6

Brian Haberly
Scott & Julie Hagan
Joel Haggard
Robert J. Hamilton
F Hanshaw/RJ Realtors
Ron & Carole Hanson
Sandy & Marilyn Harbraves
Mark & Annie Harris
Matthew Harris
Bob & Bernadean Harvey
William Haselbauer
Frank Henshaw
Jean & Frank Hewitt
Donald J. Hill
Steve Hoffman
Chris Hung
Bob Ingalls
William Irish
Marcia Jarvis
Ronald & Karen Jensen
Delores & Dale Jensen
David Johnson
Michael A. Jonson
Susan & Keith Kaiser
Gene & Shelly Kavner
Tom Kellogg
Barry & Mary Key
Tom & Lisa Kihara
Diana Kinared
A Kindig/Beak
Phillip Kirk
Randy & Debi Kyte
Lake Washington School Dist.
De-En Lang
Fifi Yahya/On Lee
L Lepp/Assoc Earth Sciences

Paul Lim
Ken & Marcela Lobb
Sarah & Mark Lowry
Jack Lynch
Rod Malcom
Richard McClain
Willis McCormick
P. McCune/Heller Ehrman
David & Beth McDonald
Jacquelyn Melton
Don Miller
Mike Miller
Michael Monroe
Panfilo & Dante Morelli
Bob & Jeanette Muender
Garret Munger
Garry & Roseanna Myall
Chris Nakano
NE Sammamish Water/Sewer Dist.
William C. Nelson
New Construction Services
Neil Nicoll
Sally Norman
G Norris/Wm Popp
Victor & Raquel Nosce
K Robinson/Ostergaard Robinson
Anne O'Rourke
Leanore Propst
Puget Sound Power & Light
Miguel & Jane Rabay
S. & Mala Raman
Redmond Planning Dept.
Sue Ann & Paul Reynolds
Devereux & Marcia Rice
James & Debby Roberson
Bill & Alison Roberts
David Rowe
Robin Ruble
Victor L. Salemann
M. Santee
Mark & Debbie Schoonover
Andrew Schuchardt
Bob & Diane Schupp
Germino Scott
Lindsey & Richard Seaver
Patty Siegwarth
Curtis Smelser
Claire Smith
Wm. Snell/Jonson & Jonson
Tami Knee/Kory Srock
George Sutherland
Ed Terpilowski
James B. Thomas
Barbara Ulrich
Dave & Debbie Van Ness
Richard & Katherine VonLehman
Dennis Willhite
David Wilken
Bill H. Williamson
Richard Wilson
J.A. & Margrit Zimmerman

**CHRYSLALIS ESTATES, WEBERS RIDGE & OLD MILL POINT
SHORELINE SUBSTANTIAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT APP.**

Page - 7

Tom Bertek, Dept. of Transportation/Roads Division
Steve Bottheim, DDES/Land Use Services Division
Lee Carte, DDES/Land Use Services Division
Laura Casey, DDES/Land Use Services Division
Luanne Coachman, DDES/Environmental Division
Peter Dye, DDES/Land Use Services Division
Lanny Henoch, DDES/Land Use Services Division
Nancy Hopkins, DDES/Land Use Services Division
Tom Koney, Metropolitan King County Council
Mark Mitchell, DDES/Land Use Services Division
Paulette Norman, Dept. of Transportation/Traffic & Planning
Lisa Pringle, DDES/Land Use Services Division
Lorin Reinelt, Surface Water Management Division
V. Rollis, WSDOT/NW Region
William C. Dues, WSDOT/NW Region
Ellen Turner, DDES/Environmental Division
King Conservation District
Steven C. Townsend, DDES/DIU
Wash. St. Dept of Ecology

The decision of the Shoreline Hearing Examiner may be appealed to the State Shoreline Hearings Board. Information on appeal procedures may be obtained from Washington State Department of Ecology, Olympia Office - telephone (206) 459-6327. Requests for review by the Hearings Board must be received by the State Department of Ecology and State Attorney General's Office within thirty (30) days of receipt by the Department of Ecology of the permit or letter of denial.

**MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 5, 6, 7, 8, AND 9, 1996, PUBLIC HEARING ON FILE NO. L95PSH019 -
CHRYSLALIS ESTATES, WEBERS RIDGE AND OLD MILL POINT SHORELINE SUBSTANTIAL
DEVELOPMENT PERMIT.**

Stafford L. Smith was the Hearing Examiner in this matter. Participating at the hearing were Lanny Henoch, Nancy Hopkins, Peter Dye, Luanne Coachman, Laura Casey, Steve Bottheim, and Lorin Reinelt, representing the County; and De-En Lang, Curtis Smelser, Matthew Harris, Bill Williamson, Robert J. Hamilton, Johanna Buehler, Gary Norris, Phil McCune, Val Rollis, Victor L. Salemann, Garret Munger, Lou Lepp, Kent Robinson, David Johnson, Andy Kindig, Steve Hoffman, Mark Harris, Brian Haberly, Dennis Willhite, Mike Golan, Jim Captain, Harry Grzelewski, John Davis, Diane Cvetovich, Joyce Garland, David Rower, Phil Kirk, Panfilo Morelli, David Bruner, James B. Thomas and Gretchen Duque.

The following exhibits were offered and entered into the hearing record February 5, 1996:

Exhibit No. 1	LUSD File No. S90P0028 (Chrysalis Estates)
Exhibit No. 2	LUSD File No. S90P0096 (Webers Ridge)
Exhibit No. 3	LUSD File S90P0105 (Old Mill Point)
Exhibit No. 4	LUSD staff report, prepared for the February 5, 1996, public hearing
Exhibit No. 5	Applicant's subdivision application for Chrysalis Estates, received April 2, 1990
Exhibit No. 6	Applicant's subdivision application for Webers Ridge, received October 30, 1990
Exhibit No. 7	Applicant's subdivision application for Old Mill Point, received November 14, 1990
Exhibit No. 8	SEPA Determination of Significance and Scoping Notice, date of issuance - March 1, 1994
Exhibit No. 9A	Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), date of issuance - July 7, 1995
9B	DEIS Appendices
9C	Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), date of issuance - December 19, 1995
Exhibit No. 10A	Affidavit of Posting for Chrysalis Estates, received January 5, 1996
10B	Affidavit of Posting for Webers Ridge, received January 5, 1996
10C	Affidavit of Posting for Old Mill Point, received January 5, 1996
Exhibit No. 11	Revised preliminary plat map for Chrysalis Estates, received January 10, 1995
Exhibit No. 12	Revised preliminary plat map for Webers Ridge, received January 8, 1996
Exhibit No. 13	Revised preliminary plat map for Old Mill Point, received January 8, 1996
Exhibit No. 14	Three project site plan, received January 8, 1996
Exhibit No. 15	Land use map - Kroll maps 530E, 573W, 534E, 535W and 535E
Exhibit No. 16	Assessor maps - SW 17-25-6 and S 1/2 18-25-6
Exhibit No. 17	SWM Variance Application (File No. L95V0059), received May 5, 1995
Exhibit No. 18A	Road Variance Application (File No. L94V0007), dated September 27, 1994

18B	(revision to application received January 24, 1994) Amendment to Road Variance (L94V0007) with cover letter dated January 15, 1996
Exhibit No. 19	Letter from Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), dated January 19, 1995, with four attachments
Exhibit No. 20	Letter from WSDOT dated January 29, 1995
Exhibit No. 21	Letter from De-En Lang, Subdivision Management Inc., dated November 8, 1995, with two attachments
Exhibit No. 22	Letter from De-En Lang, Subdivision Management, Inc., dated January 26, 1996
Exhibit No. 23	Faxed correspondence from Don Miller of G.S. C. to Lanny Henoch of LUSD, dated January 5, 1996, with two attachments
Exhibit No. 24	Memorandum from Laura Casey, Senior Ecologist, Site Development Services Section, LUSD, to Lanny Henoch, LUSD, dated January 11, 1995, with four attachments
Exhibit No. 25	Faxed letter from Philip S. Kirk, Phil Kirk and Associates, to Luanne Coachman, DDES, dated January 16, 1996, with two attachments
Exhibit No. 26	Letter from Phil Kirk and Panfilo Morelli to Stafford Smith, Deputy Hearing Examiner, and Lanny Henoch, LUSD, dated January 26, 1996, with three attachments
Exhibit No. 27	Letter dated February 2, 1996 (w/attachments) from Bill Williamson (attorney for intervenors Hamilton) to De-En Lang re stipulated voluntary mitigation conditions affecting Hamilton property
Exhibit No. 28	Additional paragraph (quote from FEIS) to page 14 of staff report
Exhibit No. 29	Colorized map showing all three plats
Exhibit No. 30	Original plat map of Old Mill Point
Exhibit No. 31	Letter dated February 2, 1996, from Robert Josephson (WSDOT) to Lanny Henoch re transportation mitigation request
Exhibit No. 32	Report and recommendation to the King County Council - Hidden Ridge (File No. 986-5)
Exhibit No. 33	Excerpt (pp 138-139) from Bear Creek Master Plan Development conditions
Exhibit No. 34	Resume' of Victor L. Salemann, PE
Exhibit No. 35	Figure 2, Appendix B, FEIS
Exhibit No. 36	Excerpt (#30) from Thomas Brothers Maps
Exhibit No. 37	Physical characteristics - locations maps - Figure 1 from FEIS

The following exhibits were offered and entered into the hearing record February 6, 1996:

Exhibit No. 38	Map of properties in area of 196th
Exhibit No. 39	Phil Kirk written notes of testimony
Exhibit No. 40	Map showing existing road and proposed road (196th)
Exhibit No. 41	Grading graphic
Exhibit No. 42	Shoreline Substantial Development Permit (SDP) application, received February 17, 1995
Exhibit No. 43	Affidavit of newspaper publication for the SDP
Exhibit No. 44	Affidavit of posting for the SDP, received January 30, 1996, indicating that on January 5, 1996, one public notice board was posted on East Lake Sammamish Parkway adjacent to the subject site.
Exhibit No. 45	Revised SDP plans, received January 12, 1996. (Note: Plan is referenced as Exhibit D-7-a in the Staff Report and SDP file)
Exhibit No. 46	King County Assessor maps: S 1/2 18-25-6 and NE 1/4 19-25-6, received February 17, 1995. (Note: Subject shoreline site is located on the S 1/2 of 18-25-6 Assessor map)
Exhibit No. 47	Faxed correspondence received January 26, 1996, from Kent L. Robinson, Ostergaard-Robinson and Associates, the applicants' engineering consultant, requesting DDES to consider alternative drainage designs (seven pages)
Exhibit No. 48	Correspondence from Robert J. and Cynthia J. Hamilton, received January 30, 1969, which includes a petition for intervention (seven pages)
Exhibit No. 49	Correspondence received February 5, 1996, from Donald Hill, D. R. Strong Consulting Engineers, representing Robert and Cynthia Hamilton (three pages)
Exhibit No. 50	Copy of King County Shoreline Code Procedures, K.C.C. 25.32.030(c), regarding newspaper notice requirements
Exhibit No. 51	LUSD Shoreline SDP File L 95SH019
Exhibit No. 52	Photographs (3) of shoreline taken by Garret Munger January 23, 1996
Exhibit No. 53	Assessors map (NE 19-25-6) showing stream path
Exhibit No. 54	Preliminary Storm Drainage Plan submitted by Kent Robinson
Exhibit No. 55	Lake Sammamish Total Phosphorous Model (METRO study)
Exhibit No. 56	Traffic calming charts submitted by Applicant

The following exhibits were offered and entered into the hearing record February 7, 1996:

Exhibit No. 57	Letter dated January 31, 1996, from Bill and Jan Armstrong expressing concern re traffic and safety
Exhibit No. 58	Several newspaper articles submitted by Mark Harris
Exhibit No. 59	4:1 Program - Marshall/Oatfield proposal
Exhibit No. 60	Letter dated February 5, 1996, from City of Redmond to Lanny Henoch
Exhibit No. 61	Packet from AMTEST with regard to testing methods and parameters
Exhibit No. 62	Jennifer Fulton (Beak) April 3, 1995, memo to Loren Reinelt (SWM)
Exhibit No. 63	Table 1 - Urban Runoff Water Quality from Selected Studies
Exhibit No. 64	Table 2 - Comparison of Beak Consultants Unmitigated Water Quality Prediction with Data from Local Studies - February 6, 1996

The following exhibits were offered and entered into the hearing record February 8, 1996:

Exhibit No. 65	Written testimony of Donald Hill
----------------	----------------------------------

The following exhibits were offered and entered into the hearing record February 9, 1996:

Exhibit No. 66	Letter received February 7, 1996, from Yetta Bennett
Exhibit No. 67	Memorandum dated February 8, 1996, from Valerie Rollis (WSDOT) to Examiner, LUSD, and Traffic Engineering Division
Exhibit No. 68	By reference - Examiner's file on Beaverdam I (File Nos. S90P0035 and L90CU023)
Exhibit No. 69	By reference - Examiner's file on Beaverdam II (File No. L94UP0001)
Exhibit No. 70	By reference - Examiner's file for Trosachs (S89P0055), Belvedere Park (S89P0025), and Brighton's Landing (S89P0028)
Exhibit No. 71	By reference - Examiner's file on Quiet Water (S91P0036)
Exhibit No. 72	Letter dated February 4, 1996, from Edward M. Boyd to Luanne Coachman
Exhibit No. 73	Photocopy of public notice in February 8, 1996, Journal American re shorelines permit application
Exhibit No. 74	Traffic counts performed by William Popp at Northeast 37th Way and Sahalee
Exhibit No. 75	Map showing traffic on existing road with connecting volumes and without connecting volumes
Exhibit No. 76	Amended proposed shoreline conditions
Exhibit No. 77	Interlocal Guidelines for Coordination with King County for Mitigation of Development Impacts
Exhibit No. 78	Amended proposed conditions submitted by staff
Exhibit No. 79	Bill Walker letter (with attachment) summarizing testimony and proposed mitigations
Exhibit No. 80	Rebuttal statement prepared by Joanna Buehler (for Save Lake Sammamish)

Exhibits offered and entered into the hearing record pursuant to an administrative continuance:

Exhibit No. 81	Waiver of Time Limits executed by Donna Dixon (Applicant Webers Ridge), William C. Nelson (Applicant Old Mill Point), and Jack Estep (Applicant Chrysalis Estates)
----------------	--

Exhibit No. 82	Letter dated February 5, 1996, from Ed Terpilowski to Gary Locke
Exhibit No. 83	Letter dated February 14, 1996, from Donald J. Hill (D.R. Strong Consulting Engineers) to Examiner providing additional testimony and Shoreline Permit comments
Exhibit No. 84	Letter dated February 23, 1996, from De-En Lang (Subdivision Management) to Examiner providing written closing argument.
Exhibit No. 85	Memorandum dated February 23, 1996, from Lanny Henoch to Examiner submitting revised language for recommended Condition 18
Exhibit No. 86	Letter dated February 23, 1996, from William C. Dues (WSDOT) to Lanny Henoch clarifying WSDOT's mitigation request

The following exhibits was offered and entered pursuant to administrative continuance:

Exhibit No. 87	Memorandum dated March 7, 1996, from Nancy Hopkins, Shoreline Planner, Land Use Services Division, to Examiner
----------------	--