

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

BEFORE THE HEARING EXAMINER  
FOR THE CITY OF SEATTLE

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

FRIENDS OF RAVENNA-COWEN

TRANSCRIPT EXCERPTS OF GEOFFREYWENDTLAND

Page 225

1 MS. NEWMAN: Cross.  
 2 HEARING EXAMINER: Cross.  
 3 MS. BENDICH: I mean cross.  
 4 MS. NEWMAN: The prehearing order allowed new exhibits.  
 5 MS. BENDICH: Yeah. I thought the prehearing order  
 6 allowed that on cross-examination. That's what I've been  
 7 doing all along here.  
 8 HEARING EXAMINER: Introducing new exhibits?  
 9 MS. BENDICH: Yes.  
 10 MS. NEWMAN: On cross.  
 11 MS. BENDICH: On cross-examination.  
 12 HEARING EXAMINER: I don't recall that.  
 13 MS. BENDICH: Well, I have.  
 14 THE COURT: Well, it must have been a different hearing.  
 15 MR. KISIELIUS: New exhibits that weren't identified on  
 16 the exhibit list?  
 17 MS. BENDICH: Yes.  
 18 HEARING EXAMINER: Yes. That's what I've been told. I  
 19 don't recall that having happened here at all.  
 20 Does the City have a copy or do you have a copy?  
 21 MS. BENDICH: I don't have a copy.  
 22 HEARING EXAMINER: And that's --  
 23 MS. BENDICH: That's why I wanted to make additional  
 24 copies and to admit later.  
 25 HEARING EXAMINER: Please make a copy, then.

Page 226

1 MS. BENDICH: Okay. The question is exactly when I can  
 2 get this back in. If Mr. Wentland is testifying tomorrow,  
 3 I certainly could do that.  
 4 HEARING EXAMINER: I don't know.  
 5 MS. BENDICH: Okay. Right. This is -- this is in your  
 6 order on the prehearing order. It is Footnote 2. It says,  
 7 Except for purposes of impeachment or rebuttal, only  
 8 those --  
 9 HEARING EXAMINER: This is not rebuttal. This is cross.  
 10 MS. NEWMAN: And impeachment.  
 11 MS. BENDICH: And impeachment.  
 12 HEARING EXAMINER: All right. You didn't say impeachment.  
 13 MS. BENDICH: Okay. I'm sorry. I did not.  
 14 HEARING EXAMINER: And you need to clarify it. And you do  
 15 need to come prepared with copies.  
 16 MS. BENDICH: Okay.  
 17 HEARING EXAMINER: We do not provide copying services  
 18 except in emergency situations.  
 19 MS. BENDICH: I understand. I completely understand that,  
 20 and it's my fault.  
 21 **Q. (By Ms. Bendich) Okay. With respect to the uptown EIS, did**  
 22 **you ever see the budget on that?**  
 23 A. I don't think so. I don't -- I don't recall.  
 24 **Q. All right. I'd like to turn to Hearing Examiner Exhibit 50,**  
 25 **which is Mr. Steinbrueck's study.**

Page 227

1 A. Do you know which binder that is?  
 2 **Q. I don't. But I'm going to give you two pages from it --**  
 3 A. Okay.  
 4 **Q. -- that I'm going to ask you questions about. Is that okay?**  
 5 A. Sure.  
 6 **Q. Okay. I believe you testified that the study was**  
 7 **undertaken, but that -- and I can't remember your precise**  
 8 **words, but that it was really just not really used. Why**  
 9 **don't you tell us what you used it for.**  
 10 A. Well, my -- I think my testimony was that this was not an  
 11 adopted -- it was not a formally adopted, you know, plan or  
 12 study. It was an advisory report and an advisory study, as  
 13 described in the cover memo here. It is one of the  
 14 documents that preparers of the EIS looked at in shaping  
 15 potential urban village boundary expansions.  
 16 **Q. Okay. So it's one of them. And one of them was that you**  
 17 **were -- where it says here on the cover page from the**  
 18 **director of the then Department of Planning and Development,**  
 19 **proposed UV boundary expansion should follow street grid,**  
 20 **preferably arterials, but not divide a cohesive**  
 21 **neighborhood. You rejected that; is that correct?**  
 22 A. No. I did not reject that.  
 23 **Q. Is it rejected in the MHA FEIS?**  
 24 A. I don't think it's rejected. I think it's one of a number  
 25 of factors that's, you know, considered.

Page 228

1 **Q. It was considered. So let's take the Roosevelt expansion**  
 2 **where it expands to the east of 15th Avenue Northeast.**  
 3 **That's a cohesive neighborhood on the east side of 15th**  
 4 **Avenue Northeast, is it not?**  
 5 A. I would say it's cohesive. It's also cohesive with the  
 6 portion of the neighborhood to the west of 15th Avenue  
 7 Northeast.  
 8 **Q. Yes. To the Cowen area; is that correct? You've heard --**  
 9 **you were sitting here through the testimony.**  
 10 A. Yeah. I don't know exactly what you mean by the Cowen area,  
 11 but I would say that it's fair to say that it's cohesive on  
 12 both sides; that it's, you know, cohesive across 15th.  
 13 **Q. All right. You heard testimony from others that there**  
 14 **have -- there are no commercial buildings, other than along**  
 15 **15th, other than a long 65th Street that are east of 15th**  
 16 **Avenue Northeast, did you not?**  
 17 A. I don't remember that specific testimony, but I -- that  
 18 sounds consistent with my understanding.  
 19 **Q. And that there are no multistory apartment buildings, other**  
 20 **than along Northeast 65th Street within that area that's**  
 21 **east of Northeast 15th, correct?**  
 22 A. I can't say for certain whether that's correct or not. I  
 23 also don't recall the specific testimony you're referring  
 24 to.  
 25 **Q. Okay. So let us just assume that it is. You said that**