BEFORE THE HEARING EXAMINER
FOR THE CITY OF SEATTLE

| | |
|---|---|
| In the Matter of the Appeals of<br><br>WALLINGFORD COMMUNITY COUNCIL, ET AL.<br><br>Of Adequacy of FEIS Issued by the Director, Office of Planning and Community Development | Hearing Examiner File:<br>**W-17-006 through**<br>W-17-014 |

FRIENDS OF RAVENNA-COWEN

TRANSCRIPT EXCERPTS OF MIKE LEECH

FRIENDS OF RAVENNA-COWEN
JUDITH E. BENDICH, WSBA# 3754
AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE,
1754 NE 62ND ST., SEATTLE, WA 98115
206-525-5914

Page 153

**not?**
A. That's a good question.
**Q. And to be totally fair, I would love it if you had a computer open that had good PDF's and search function so that we could do this.**
A. Me, too. I believe they were included for within those -- those designations.
**Q. Were you here when I testified before lunch, or right after? I can't even remember --**
A. Today, yes.
**Q. Yes. Did you hear me testify about the loss of right-of-way trees next to projects?**
A. Yes.
**Q. Was that kind of impact included somehow in this data analysis, or in your -- in your subjective determination of where there was -- where there were impacts?**
A. So in the data analysis, that was not included when we were doing the calculations in these summary tables, no.
HEARING EXAMINER: Pause there. Come back at 3:15. Thank you.
(Recess)
HEARING EXAMINER: We return with cross of Mr. Leech.
MR. THALER: Okay. Thank you.
**Q. (By Mr. Thaler) So how are we to determine whether the right-of-way trees are included or not? That's really a key**

Page 154

**question. So a question that relates to that is, does it -- even assuming that right-of-way trees are not going to change, wouldn't including the right-of-way trees in the analysis skew the data?**
A. We -- we wanted to -- we included the right-of-way areas within the designations as part of our analysis.
**Q. Okay. Did the assumptions include -- what did the assumptions -- how did the assumptions deal with changes to the right-of-way trees as a result of the zoning changes?**
HEARING EXAMINER: Did you have a response?
A. I'm sorry. Can you repeat the question again?
**Q. (By Mr. Thaler) How would you include in your impact analysis what's happening -- what assumptions did you make in your impact analysis in all these tables of percentage changes without having the tree -- the right-of-way trees separately accounted for? In other words, how do -- what assumptions did you make with respect to the change in the right-of-way trees as opposed to the private land trees?**
A. They were -- they were grouped together as part -- within each -- within a zoning designation, we included the right-of-way trees as part of that designation. So there's areas that -- that are part of the right-of-way within each of those zoning designations, and we included those, all of those areas in our calculations.
**Q. Where are the assumptions spelled out?**

Page 155

A. On the assessment methodology on page 3.317. We stepped through the assessor's methodology, continuing on to 3.318.
**Q. So my question earlier about the -- how could you determine that there was zero percent change from an LR1 to an LR3-M is buried in that last paragraph there where it says, "For example, a zone change from LR to LR would not represent a change." Is that correct?**
A. Yes.
**Q. The right-of-way assumption is not explicit in here, is it? Or if it is, please point it out to me.**
A. It's not explicit.
**Q. Okay. Who on the team was the ultimate decider for making the decisions as to what was in and out in the assumptions and how they were to be addressed?**
A. That would be Geoff and Sharese.
**Q. So between the two of them, I'd have to ask?**
A. Yes.
**Q. That includes the assumption of full build-out and how it relates to land use changes and how the zoning code is applied?**
A. Yes.
**Q. Is there any -- was there any ground truthing done?**
A. For the -- to --
**Q. For the assessment that you worked on.**
A. The assessment that was provided to us?

Page 156

**Q. Either the data that you got from Vermont through the city, or -- well, correct me if I'm wrong, back up one step -- I'm assuming that you're testifying here because you're responsible for the 2016 assessment document.**
A. I'm responsible for the analysis that was performed in the EIS.
**Q. In the EIS. And who was ultimately responsible for the 2016 document?**
A. The -- are you referring to the -- the tree canopy assessment that was done by the University of Vermont Spatial Analysis Lab?
**Q. So they are the author of that document?**
A. Yes.
**Q. Did you have any feedback into how it was edited or --**
A. I did not.
**Q. Okay. And an impact analysis and an impact assessment of the changes to be imposed in a number -- in over two dozen urban villages around the city, do you think it would make sense to do -- to separate the data to do it urban village by urban village?**
A. We made a determination that for this programmatic level, that the analysis that we had completed was sufficient for this EIS.
**Q. Did you do any analysis of the distinction between inside and outside urban villages?**

Page 157

A. We evaluated the areas within each of the proposed zoning alternatives. So that was within -- within the project extent.
**Q. But no division by land to be in urban villages; i.e., urban villages as expanded, and all the L and C and NC zones outside the urban villages?**
A. To my knowledge, we didn't do an evaluation outside of those areas, only within the -- the project extent.
**Q. Okay. The project extent includes all of it. It's the division that I'm curious about. How do you define the project area? Do you need to look at a map?**
A. If I can go back to the --
**Q. The project area will be in section 1 of the EIS or 2.1, 1.2.**
**(Inaudible colloquy)**
**Q. (By Mr. Thaler) Try 2.3, study area. Exhibit 2-1 on page 2.3. So you understand that the dark outlined areas are urban villages, but that there is significant study area outside the urban villages?**
A. Yes.
**Q. So the question is, was there any analysis based on that distinction, in and out?**
A. The analysis that was performed for the tree canopy assessment was presented in --
**Q. Well, no, for the EIS. Well, no, that's a question. If**

Page 158

**you're doing an analysis of impacts in the study area, and considering it on this large spatial extent, but you're relying on a report from somebody else; i.e., the Vermont group, if that report is limited in terms of the assumptions and how the data is displayed, then your analysis is going to be likewise limited, isn't it?**
A. No. The data set that was provided to us by Vermont was one input data layer. Then we were provided -- the city provided us the data sets, GIS data layers for the various alternatives. And through the process of an overlay operation, we -- we can assess the tree canopy cover for the various alternatives.
**Q. Okay. So the project team could have pulled out an inside/outside urban village?**
A. Yes. Yeah. It's possible that we, you know, we could've -- could've done more.
**Q. And you could've done the urban village itself, each one?**
A. Yes, those calculations could be made.
**Q. Okay. I think I'm almost done. The 2016 Seattle canopy assessment -- and my apology if I've asked this -- it was not peer reviewed, was it?**
A. To my knowledge, no.
**Q. Have you ever worked on a peer-reviewed document? Have you published?**
A. I have not published a peer-reviewed document.

Page 159

**Q. Is there any place in the EIS or the documents directly referenced by it, the 2016 document being the primary one, that explain how the leaf-off LiDAR data was accounted for in the impact assessment?**
A. To my knowledge, those methods were not detailed in the impact assessment.
**Q. Or in the 2016 document, other than the reference?**
A. Yeah, by reference, the methods are described, but not --
**Q. Okay.**
MR. BRICKLIN: You done?
MR. THALER: Unless you want to feed me something, or you've got something.
MR. BRICKLIN: We can ask our own.
MS. BENDICH: I have a few.
HEARING EXAMINER: They can ask their own questions.
MS. BENDICH: I have a --
MR. BRICKLIN: We can ask our own.
HEARING EXAMINER: Yeah. Separate parties.
MS. BENDICH: Yes, Your Honor.
MR. THALER: Go for it. I'm done. Thank you very much.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
CROSS EXAMINATION
BY MS. BENDICH:
**Q. So, Mr. Leech, I just have a few follow-up questions based on what Mr. Thaler was asking you, if you'll bear with me.**

Page 160

A. Sure.
**Q. You mentioned something about a significant amount of ground work. I just want to know what that means.**
A. Oh. In terms of an accuracy assessment for remote sensing methods, there's various ways to assess the accuracy of data products. In some cases, there is ground data collection that is ground truthing, to go out in the field and collect point data, or within fixed radius polygons, various techniques for collecting data on the ground to confirm or validate that the areas to be mapped are -- are what -- what they say they are from the classification.
**Q. But that wasn't done in this case; is that correct?**
A. That's correct.
**Q. And why is that signif- -- I mean, what I want to know is, why do people even do -- you said to make sure it was verifiable, I suppose.**
A. Yeah, there's various methods for conducting, kind of assessing the overall accuracy of data products. So with traditional remote sensing methods, that was the traditional approach was to either put people on the ground to collect the data within the study area, or use high resolution imagery, different imagery from what's being used in the -- in the classification to confirm that, yes, this is a tree in that location. So there's different methods to doing accuracy assessments. And based on the resources available

Page 157

A. We evaluated the areas within each of the proposed zoning alternatives. So that was within -- within the project extent.
**Q. But no division by land to be in urban villages; i.e., urban villages as expanded, and all the L and C and NC zones outside the urban villages?**
A. To my knowledge, we didn't do an evaluation outside of those areas, only within the -- the project extent.
**Q. Okay. The project extent includes all of it. It's the division that I'm curious about. How do you define the project area? Do you need to look at a map?**
A. If I can go back to the --
**Q. The project area will be in section 1 of the EIS or 2.1, 1.2.**
**(Inaudible colloquy)**
**Q. (By Mr. Thaler) Try 2.3, study area. Exhibit 2-1 on page 2.3. So you understand that the dark outlined areas are urban villages, but that there is significant study area outside the urban villages?**
A. Yes.
**Q. So the question is, was there any analysis based on that distinction, in and out?**
A. The analysis that was performed for the tree canopy assessment was presented in --
**Q. Well, no, for the EIS. Well, no, that's a question. If**

Page 158

**you're doing an analysis of impacts in the study area, and considering it on this large spatial extent, but you're relying on a report from somebody else; i.e., the Vermont group, if that report is limited in terms of the assumptions and how the data is displayed, then your analysis is going to be likewise limited, isn't it?**
A. No. The data set that was provided to us by Vermont was one input data layer. Then we were provided -- the city provided us the data sets, GIS data layers for the various alternatives. And through the process of an overlay operation, we -- we can assess the tree canopy cover for the various alternatives.
**Q. Okay. So the project team could have pulled out an inside/outside urban village?**
A. Yes. Yeah. It's possible that we, you know, we could've -- could've done more.
**Q. And you could've done the urban village itself, each one?**
A. Yes, those calculations could be made.
**Q. Okay. I think I'm almost done. The 2016 Seattle canopy assessment -- and my apology if I've asked this -- it was not peer reviewed, was it?**
A. To my knowledge, no.
**Q. Have you ever worked on a peer-reviewed document? Have you published?**
A. I have not published a peer-reviewed document.

Page 159

**Q. Is there any place in the EIS or the documents directly referenced by it, the 2016 document being the primary one, that explain how the leaf-off LiDAR data was accounted for in the impact assessment?**
A. To my knowledge, those methods were not detailed in the impact assessment.
**Q. Or in the 2016 document, other than the reference?**
A. Yeah, by reference, the methods are described, but not --
**Q. Okay.**
MR. BRICKLIN: You done?
MR. THALER: Unless you want to feed me something, or you've got something.
MR. BRICKLIN: We can ask our own.
MS. BENDICH: I have a few.
HEARING EXAMINER: They can ask their own questions.
MS. BENDICH: I have a --
MR. BRICKLIN: We can ask our own.
HEARING EXAMINER: Yeah. Separate parties.
MS. BENDICH: Yes, Your Honor.
MR. THALER: Go for it. I'm done. Thank you very much.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
CROSS EXAMINATION
BY MS. BENDICH:
**Q. So, Mr. Leech, I just have a few follow-up questions based on what Mr. Thaler was asking you, if you'll bear with me.**

Page 160

A. Sure.
**Q. You mentioned something about a significant amount of ground work. I just want to know what that means.**
A. Oh. In terms of an accuracy assessment for remote sensing methods, there's various ways to assess the accuracy of data products. In some cases, there is ground data collection that is ground truthing, to go out in the field and collect point data, or within fixed radius polygons, various techniques for collecting data on the ground to confirm or validate that the areas to be mapped are -- are what -- what they say they are from the classification.
**Q. But that wasn't done in this case; is that correct?**
A. That's correct.
**Q. And why is that signif- -- I mean, what I want to know is, why do people even do -- you said to make sure it was verifiable, I suppose.**
A. Yeah, there's various methods for conducting, kind of assessing the overall accuracy of data products. So with traditional remote sensing methods, that was the traditional approach was to either put people on the ground to collect the data within the study area, or use high resolution imagery, different imagery from what's being used in the -- in the classification to confirm that, yes, this is a tree in that location. So there's different methods to doing accuracy assessments. And based on the resources available

**Bricklin:** [00:40:33] Can you take a look at, do you have the EIS there? Can you turn to page 3.329?

**Leech:** [00:40:41] Yes.

**Bricklin:** [00:40:42] Right there?

**Leech:** [00:40:43] I actually was already there.

**Bricklin:** [00:40:43] Perfect.

**HE:** [00:40:45] What page was that?

**Bricklin:** [00:40:45] 3.329. And I'm looking at the bottom exhibit 3.6-6, which shows tree cover by different groupings of urban villages. You see that, the first line are urban villages that are in the high displacement risk, a high access to opportunity, and next line is high displacement low access, etc.

**Leech:** [00:41:28] I see the table, yes.

**Bricklin:** [00:41:29] Right. Were you involved in the creation of that table?

**Leech:** [00:41:33] Yes I was supported the calculations.

**Bricklin:** [00:41:36] And did those, did that table aggregate then, it identified the urban villages in the first category of high displacement high access and averaged them out and came up with those numbers?

**Leech:** [00:41:51] Specifically, there, the data was coded with these categories for displacement and access. So in GIS it's very easy to do the overlay and then quantify the amount of tree canopy by that, by how the data is represented in the data set.

**Bricklin:** [00:42:09] So it'd be very easy then to code it. Instead of just doing it by one of these four categories doing it by the Urban Village designation right?

**Leech:** [00:42:18] It'd be very easy to run the calculation, again there's the whole steps of then, once you finish the calculation going through to review and then all the way to the development of the reports. So I say it's easy but there is a process to do it, but yes. In general it can be done.

**Bricklin:** [00:42:41] Given the scope of the amount of work you were doing it would not have taken a lot more effort to code it, to break it out by UV instead of by one of these four categories right?

**Leech:** [00:42:49] It's possible yes.

**Bricklin:** [00:43:02] Thank you. That's all I have.

**HE:** [00:43:05] Redirect.

**Mitchell:** [00:43:09] Let's start where are we where we left off. I think you, we started looking at exhibit 3.6-6 and you indicated that you hadn't gone to the granular, to the level of looking at tree