

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
26

BEFORE THE HEARING EXAMINER
FOR THE CITY OF SEATTLE

In Re: Appeal by

SAVE MADISON VALLEY

of Decisions Re Land Use Application,
Design Review, and Code Interpretation
for 2925 East Madison Street, Project
3020338-LU and 3028345

HEARING EXAMINER FILE:
MUP 18-020 (DR, W) & S-18-011

DECLARATION OF BRYAN
TELEGIN IN SUPPORT OF SAVE
MADISON VALLEY'S RESPONSE
TO SDCI'S MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION

I, BRYAN TELEGIN, declare as follows:

1. I am over the age of 18 and am competent to testify herein. I am an attorney with the law firm of Bricklin & Newman, LLP, counsel for Appellant Save Madison Valley. I make this declaration based on my own personal knowledge.
2. Attached hereto as **Exhibit A** is a true and correct copy of a Save Madison Valley's Preliminary Witness and Exhibit List (Oct. 19, 2018). This list was served on SDCI on October 19, 2018.
3. Attached hereto as **Exhibit B** is a true and correct copy of Save Madison Valley's Final Witness and Exhibit List (Nov. 20, 2018). This list was served on SDCI on November 20, 2019.

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
26

4. Attached hereto as **Exhibit C** is a true and correct copy of Seattle Ordinance 118477, also known as Initiative 42. I obtained this copy of Initiative 42 from the Seattle City Clerk’s website at <http://clerk.seattle.gov/search/ordinances/>.

5. Attached hereto as **Exhibit D** is a true and correct copy of a news article dated August 1, 1996 titled “Group Seeks Park Protection – Initiative Would Bar Sales Without Hearing.” I obtained a copy of this news article from the website of the Seattle Public Library.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated this 14th day of March, 2019 at Bainbridge Island, Washington.

s/ Bryan Telegin
Bryan Telegin

**Telegin Declaration
Exhibit A**

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
26

BEFORE THE HEARING EXAMINER
FOR THE CITY OF SEATTLE

In Re: Appeal by

SAVE MADISON VALLEY

of Decisions Re Land Use Application,
Design Review, and Code Interpretation
for 2925 East Madison Street, Project
3020338-LU and 3028345

HEARING EXAMINER FILE:
MUP 18-020 (DR, W) & S-18-011

APPELLANT’S PRELIMINARY
WITNESS AND EXHIBIT LIST

Pursuant to the Hearing Examiner’s Second Amended Prehearing Order (Sept. 26, 2018),
Appellant Save Madison Valley submits the following preliminary lits of witnesses and exhibits:

I. WITNESSES

Appellant may call the following witnesses to testify at the appeal hearing. The general
subject matter of their expected testimony is noted below.

1. Tony Hacker. Mr. Hacker is a resident in the Madison Valley Neighborhood who lives adjacent to the proposed project site. If called, Mr. Hacker is expected to testify primarily about the existing environment on and near the project site that will be affected by the East Madison Street Proposal, including discussion about past flooding events that have caused injury to the neighborhood. He may also testify about the probable significant adverse impacts of the Proposal and the inadequacy of the disclosure and analysis of those impacts by SDCI. The impacts that he may discuss include,

1 but are not limited to, height, bulk and scale impacts, aesthetic impacts, impacts on traffic and
2 transportation, construction-related impacts, storm- and wastewater impacts, and impacts associated
3 with the loss of trees and wildlife habitat.

4 Mr. Hacker will also testify about how the Director erred in failing to collect information about
5 potential significant impacts that will be caused by the Proposal. He will also demonstrate that the
6 information provided by the applicant in the environmental checklist and the supplemental
7 information relied upon by the responsible official to issue a DNS was inadequate, misleading,
8 incomplete, and incorrect.

9
10 Mr. Hacker may also testify about facts that are relevant to provide context or background for
11 expert and legal discussion about the Proposal's inconsistencies with the Design Guidelines. He may
12 also testify about facts that are relevant to the legal arguments concerned the Design Review, SEPA
13 review, and land use review processes, how they were handled, how they violated SEPA requirements,
14 and how they did not allow for meaningful public participation.

15
16 2. Kevin Murphy. Mr. Murphy is a resident in the Madison Valley Neighborhood who
17 lives near the proposed project site. If called, Mr. Murphy is expected to describe the existing
18 environment on and near the project site that will be affected by the East Madison Street Proposal. He
19 may also testify to some degree about the probable significant adverse impacts of the Proposal and the
20 inadequacy of the disclosure and analysis of those impacts by SDCI. The impacts that he may discuss
21 include, but are not limited to, height, bulk and scale impacts, aesthetic impacts, impacts on traffic and
22 transportation, construction-related impacts, noise impacts, storm- and wastewater impacts, and
23 impacts associated with the loss of trees and wildlife habitat. He will also testify about how the
24 Director erred in failing to collect information about the potential impacts that will be caused by the
25 Proposal.
26

1 3. Wallis Bolz. Ms. Bolz is a resident of Madison Valley Neighborhood who lives near
2 the proposed project site. If called, Ms. Bolz is expected to testify about the existing environment on
3 and near the project site that will be affected by the East Madison Street Proposal, specifically with
4 respect to the existing the Mad P-Patch garden. She will also testify about how the Proposal will
5 significantly and adversely impact the Mad P-Patch community and describe the extent that the
6 Director failed to collect the necessary and adequate information upon which to make a determination
7 on whether the proposal would have significant adverse impacts to the Mad P-Patch garden.
8

9 4. Jay McCleery. Mr. McCleery is a resident of Madison Valley Neighborhood who lives
10 near the proposed project site. If called, Mr. McCleery is expected to testify about applicant's solar
11 study and describe, as a lay person, what that study reveals and what it doesn't reveal with respect to
12 impacts caused by the buiding's shadows and blocking daylight.
13

14 5. Andrew Kirsh. Mr. Kirsh is a resident of Madison Valley who is a hobby birder. He
15 will testify as either an expert or lay witness (as deemed appropriate) about the species of birds that
16 are present on the site.

17 6. Peter Steinbrueck. Steinbrueck Urban Strategies. Mr. Steinbrueck will testify as an
18 expert witness about Design Review, SEPA review, and code interpretations to the extent that they
19 relate to land use and aesthetic (including height bulk and scale) issues. He is expected to describe the
20 existing environment, specify the probable significant adverse impacts that will be caused by the
21 Proposal, and discuss reasonable mitigation that should have been considered related to land use and
22 aesthetics (including height, bulk, and scale). He is expected to testify that SDCI did not require or
23 collect the necessary and adequate information upon which to make a determination on whether the
24 East Madison Street Proposal would have significant adverse impacts related to land use and aesthetics
25 (including height, bulk, and scale). He is expected to testify that the significant adverse environmental
26

1 impacts related to land use and aesthetics were not adequately disclosed, analyzed, or mitigated by
2 SDCI and the City's regulations do not adequately address or mitigate the environmental impacts of
3 this Proposal. He is expected to explain how the Proposal is inconsistent with the spirit and intent of
4 the height limit provision in the code.

5
6 Mr. Steinbrueck is also expected to testify about how the East Madison Street Proposal is
7 inconsistent with the Citywide Design Guidelines and SDCI and the Design Review Board misapplied
8 and misconstrued these Design Guidelines when it recommended approval of the Proposal. His
9 testimony is expected to provide facts and context for the argument that SDCI erred when it concluded
10 that the decision and recommendation of the Design Review Board was consistent with the Design
11 Guidelines. Mr. Steinbrueck's Curriculum Vitae is included in Appellant's exhibit list.

12
13 7. Tina Cohen. Ms. Cohen will testify as an expert witness about SEPA review, Design
14 Review, and code interpretations to the extent that they relate to tree and vegetation issues. She is
15 expected to testify about the existing environment, the probable significant adverse impacts that will
16 be caused by the Proposal, and reasonable mitigation that should have been considered related to trees
17 and vegetation. She is expected to testify about how SDCI did not require or collect the correct,
18 necessary and adequate information upon which to make a determination on whether the East Madison
19 Street Proposal would have significant adverse impacts related to trees and vegetation. She is expected
20 to testify that the significant adverse environmental impacts related to trees and vegetation were not
21 adequately disclosed, analyzed, or mitigated by SDCI, that the City's regulations do not adequately
22 address or mitigate the environmental impacts of this Proposal, and that the mitigation proposed by
23 the Applicant and accepted by SDCI is not adequate.

24
25
26

1 Ms. Cohen is also expected to provide testimony that is relevant to the East Madison Street
2 Proposal is inconsistent with the Citywide Design Guidelines to the extent that trees or vegetation are
3 addressed by those Guidelines.

4 Ms. Cohen is also expected to provide expert information and opinion with respect to the
5 Appellant's contention that the East Madison Street Proposal is inconsistent with the tree removal
6 restrictions set forth in Ch. 25.11 SMC. She will provide facts and background to demonstrate why
7 the proposed removal of trees does not comply with the requirements set forth in SMC 25.11.040;
8 SMC 25.11.050; SMC 25.11.080; SMC 25.11.090. She will explain that the applicant did not
9 adequately identify the trees that are subject to the code limitations; did not demonstrate that removal
10 of trees is justified; did not meet the canopy replacement requirements in the code; and did not meet
11 the replacement and restoration requirements in the code. Ms. Cohen will testify that the mitigation
12 plan will not meet code requirements.

13 Ms. Cohen's Curriculum Vitae is included in the Appellants exhibit list.

14
15
16 8. Ross Tilghman. Mr. Tilghman is a transportation planner and owner of the Tilghman
17 Group. Mr. Tilghman will testify as an expert witness about Design Review, SEPA review, and code
18 interpretations to the extent that they relate to traffic and transportation issues. He is expected to testify
19 that SDCI did not require or collect the necessary and adequate information upon which to make a
20 determination on whether the East Madison Street Proposal would have significant adverse impacts
21 related to traffic and transportation. He is also expected to testify about the existing environment, the
22 probable significant adverse impacts that will be caused by the Proposal, and reasonable mitigation
23 that should have been considered related to traffic and transportation impacts. He will testify about
24 congestion and safety impacts on residential streets in the single family neighborhood adjacent to and
25 near the proposal and/or other streets at the top of the hill (including Madison and Lake Washington
26

1 Blvd.) and about how intersections in the area will be affected by the proposal. He will testify about
2 impacts that will result from the design and use of the commercial entrance on Madison. He will testify
3 about impacts associated with the access to the site to and from Dewey. He is expected to testify that
4 the significant adverse environmental impacts related to traffic and transportation impacts were not
5 adequately disclosed, analyzed, or mitigated by SDCI and the City's regulations do not adequately
6 address or mitigate the environmental impacts of this Proposal. He will also cover topics that were
7 set forth in letters that he prepared and submitted during the review process including issues with the
8 traffic report submitted by the applicant. Mr. Tilghman's Curriculum Vitae is included in the
9 Appellants exhibit list.
10

11 9. Tom Spangenberg. Mr. Spangenberg is a water resources engineer with 20 years of
12 experience in hydraulic, hydrologic, and drainage engineering involving, *inter alia*, combined systems
13 capacity analysis, urban stormwater infrastructure analysis, FEMA floodplain mapping, floodplain
14 restoration, and fish passage analysis. His technical expertise spans from conceptual design through
15 alternatives analysis, final design, and preparation of construction documents.
16

17 Mr. Spangenberg is expected to testify as an expert witness about adverse stormwater impacts
18 associated with the project and lack of reasonably sufficient information in support of the city's
19 threshold determination. Mr. Spangenberg's testimony is expected to include issues relating to the risk
20 of future flooding caused by adding more stormwater to the city's combined drainage system, impacts
21 on water quality in Lake Washington from combined sewer overflow events, the deadly storm event
22 and flooding of 2006, which took the life of one neighborhood resident, and groundwater impacts.
23

24 Mr. Spangenberg's Curriculum Vitae is included in the Appellants exhibit list.

25 10. Shawn Ketchum Johnson. Mr. Johnson is a scenic designer and visual artist who works
26 for Seattle University. Mr. Johnson designed and built a 3D model of the proposal and he will describe

1 the process for building the model. Mr. Johnson's Curriculum Vitae is included in the Appellants
2 exhibit list.

3 11. Scott Maco, Director of Research and Development at the Davey Institute. Mr. Maco
4 leads development of the i-Tree Tools. If called, Mr. Maco would testify as an expert witness about
5 the benefits and value of the trees currently and how those benefits and values will be impacted by the
6 proposal. Mr. Maco's testimony would include similar information as was provide in comment letters
7 that were submitted by Matthew Patterson during the land use review process that are in the public
8 record for this proposal. Mr. Maco's Curriculum Vitae is included in the Appellants exhibit list
9

10 12. Witnesses named by other parties in this matter.

11 Appellant reserves the right to call additional rebuttal witnesses; to supplement this disclosure
12 with witnesses and/or experts as the case is developed; to call records custodians to verify the
13 authenticity of records; to call any witnesses identified by other parties to this appeal and to call
14 rebuttal witnesses; and to call replacement witnesses if any of the witnesses identified above become
15 unavailable.
16

17 18 **II. EXHIBITS**

19 Appellant identifies the following exhibits it may use at the hearing in this matter:

20 1. All files and records that have been uploaded and are listed on the Project Portal
21 online for DCI Project No. 3020338-LU; DCI Project No. 3028345-IR; DCI Project No.; 6541076-
22 CN; DCI Project No. 6610469-CN.

23 2. All files and records that are listed in the Preliminary SDCI List of Exhibits and
24 Witnesses (October 15, 2018).
25

26 3. Curriculum Vitae of Tom Spangenberg

- 1 4. Curriculum Vitae of Tina Cohen
- 2 5. Curriculum Vitae of Peter Steinbrueck
- 3 6. Curriculum Vitae of Ross Tilghman
- 4 7. Curriculum Vitae of Scott Maco
- 5 8. Curriculum Vitae of Shawn Ketchum Johnson
- 6 9. Navix, Stormwater Drainage Report (Nov. 17, 2017)
- 7 10. CH2M Hill, Madison and Mercer/30th Flooding Investigation Findings Report (April
- 8 2007)
- 9 11. Northwest Hydraulic Consultants, Madison Valley In-Basin Analysis of Long-Term
- 10 Alternatives, Final Report (Oct. 2008)
- 11 12. Photos of 2006 flood event and damage
- 12 13. Videos and photographs of the existing project site and surrounding area.
- 13 14. Graphics/Maps that identify location points for traffic and transportation discussion
- 14 15. Graphic/Map of Madison Frontage
- 15 16. Annotated SEPA checklist
- 16 17. 3D Model of the Proposal
- 17 18. Topographic site plan with tree labels incorporated
- 18 19. Site plan showing tree driplines, groves, and exceptional trees
- 19 20. Landscape Plans with green factor areas highlighted
- 20 21. Email from Wallis Bolz to Magda Hogness (Jan. 24, 2017)
- 21 22. Email from Paddy McDonald to PRC (Jan. 25, 2017)
- 22 23. Email from Maluhia Pacal to PRC (Jan. 25, 2017)
- 23 24. Email from Austin Smith to PRC (Jan. 30, 2017)

- 1 25. Letter from Paul Crowther to Chris Davidson and Magda Hogness (June 6, 2017)
- 2 26. Email from Save Madison Valley to PRC (June 4, 2017)
- 3 27. Email from Andrew Kirsh to PRC (May 24, 2017)
- 4 28. Email from Save Madison Valley to PRC (May 22, 2017)
- 5 29. Peter Steinbrueck EDG3 Public Comments (Jan. 27, 2017).
- 6 30. Email from Ross Tilghman to Magda Hogness (Jan. 18, 2017)
- 7 31. Memo from Ross Tilghman to Melissa Stoker (Sep. 9, 2016)
- 8 32. Memo from Ross Tilghman to Melissa Stoker (May 1, 2017)
- 9 33. Letter from Claudia Newman to Magda Hogness and PRC re: comments on MUP
- 10 Application (May 23, 2017).
- 11
- 12 34. Request for Code Interpretation from Claudia Newman to SDCI (May 23, 2017)
- 13 35. SDCI Director's Rule 21-2017
- 14 36. Letter from Matthew Patterson to the Seattle Design Review Board (Jul. 12, 2016)
- 15 37. Letter from Matthew Patterson to the Seattle Design Review Board (Oct. 14, 2016)
- 16 38. Appellant may rely on and submit either portions of or the entire City of Seattle
- 17 Comprehensive Plan and Citywide Design Guidelines.
- 18

19 In addition to the exhibits identified above, appellant reserves the right to introduce exhibits

20 identified by any other party, to introduce additional exhibits as allowed by the City of Seattle Hearing

21 Examiner Rules, and to introduce additional exhibits during cross-examination or rebuttal.

22

23

24


25

26

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
26

Dated this 19th day of October, 2018.

Respectfully submitted,
BRICKLIN & NEWMAN, LLP

By: 

Claudia M. Newman, WSBA No. 24928
Bryan Telegin, WSBA No. 46686
Attorneys for Save Madison Valley

**Telegin Declaration
Exhibit B**

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
26

BEFORE THE HEARING EXAMINER
FOR THE CITY OF SEATTLE

In Re: Appeal by

SAVE MADISON VALLEY

of Decisions Re Land Use Application,
Design Review, and Code Interpretation
for 2925 East Madison Street, Project
3020338-LU and 3028345

HEARING EXAMINER FILE:
MUP 18-020 (DR, W) & S-18-011

APPELLANT’S FINAL WITNESS
AND EXHIBIT LIST

Pursuant to the Hearing Examiner’s Second Amended Prehearing Order (Sept. 26, 2018),
Appellant Save Madison Valley submits the following final list of witnesses and exhibits:

I. WITNESSES

Appellant may call the following witnesses to testify at the appeal hearing. The general
subject matter of their expected testimony is noted below.

1. Tony Hacker. Mr. Hacker is a resident in the Madison Valley Neighborhood who lives adjacent to the proposed project site. If called, Mr. Hacker is expected to testify primarily about the existing environment on and near the project site that will be affected by the East Madison Street Proposal, including discussion about past flooding events that have caused injury to the neighborhood. He may also testify about the probable significant adverse impacts of the Proposal and the inadequacy of the disclosure and analysis of those impacts by SDCI. The impacts that he may discuss include,

1 but are not limited to, height, bulk and scale impacts, aesthetic impacts, impacts on traffic and
2 transportation, construction-related impacts, storm- and wastewater impacts, and impacts associated
3 with the loss of trees and wildlife habitat.

4 Mr. Hacker will also testify about how the Director erred in failing to collect information about
5 potential significant impacts that will be caused by the Proposal. He will also demonstrate that the
6 information provided by the applicant in the environmental checklist and the supplemental
7 information relied upon by the responsible official to issue a DNS was inadequate, misleading,
8 incomplete, and incorrect.

9
10 Mr. Hacker may also testify about facts that are relevant to provide context or background for
11 expert and legal discussion about the Proposal's inconsistencies with the Design Guidelines. He may
12 also testify about facts that are relevant to the legal arguments concerned the Design Review, SEPA
13 review, and land use review processes, how they were handled, how they violated SEPA requirements,
14 and how they did not allow for meaningful public participation.

15
16 2. Kevin Murphy. Mr. Murphy is a resident in the Madison Valley Neighborhood who
17 lives near the proposed project site. If called, Mr. Murphy is expected to describe the existing
18 environment on and near the project site that will be affected by the East Madison Street Proposal. He
19 may also testify to some degree about the probable significant adverse impacts of the Proposal and the
20 inadequacy of the disclosure and analysis of those impacts by SDCI. The impacts that he may discuss
21 include, but are not limited to, height, bulk and scale impacts, aesthetic impacts, impacts on traffic and
22 transportation, construction-related impacts, noise impacts, storm- and wastewater impacts, and
23 impacts associated with the loss of trees and wildlife habitat. He will also testify about how the
24 Director erred in failing to collect information about the potential impacts that will be caused by the
25 Proposal.
26

1 3. Wallis Bolz. Ms. Bolz is a resident of Madison Valley Neighborhood who lives near
2 the proposed project site. If called, Ms. Bolz is expected to testify about the existing environment on
3 and near the project site that will be affected by the East Madison Street Proposal, specifically with
4 respect to the existing the Mad P-Patch garden. She will also testify about how the Proposal will
5 significantly and adversely impact the Mad P-Patch community and describe the extent that the
6 Director failed to collect the necessary and adequate information upon which to make a determination
7 on whether the proposal would have significant adverse impacts to the Mad P-Patch garden.
8

9 4. Jay McCleery. Mr. McCleery is a resident of Madison Valley Neighborhood who lives
10 near the proposed project site. If called, Mr. McCleery is expected to testify about applicant's solar
11 study and describe, as a lay person, what that study reveals and what it doesn't reveal with respect to
12 impacts caused by the building's shadows and blocking daylight. In the event of Mr. McCleery's
13 absence, Appellant reserves the right to call a replacement witness to address the same issues,
14 including but not limited to Andrew Kirsh.
15

16 5. Andrew Kirsh. Mr. Kirsh is a resident of Madison Valley who is a hobby birder. He
17 will testify as either an expert or lay witness (as deemed appropriate) about the species of birds that
18 are present on the site.
19

20 6. Peter Steinbrueck. Steinbrueck Urban Strategies. Mr. Steinbrueck will testify as an
21 expert witness about Design Review, SEPA review, and code interpretations to the extent that they
22 relate to land use and aesthetic (including height bulk and scale) issues. He is expected to describe the
23 existing environment, specify the probable significant adverse impacts that will be caused by the
24 Proposal, and discuss reasonable mitigation that should have been considered related to land use and
25 aesthetics (including height, bulk, and scale). He is expected to testify that SDCI did not require or
26 collect the necessary and adequate information upon which to make a determination on whether the

1 East Madison Street Proposal would have significant adverse impacts related to land use and aesthetics
2 (including height, bulk, and scale). He is expected to testify that the significant adverse environmental
3 impacts related to land use and aesthetics were not adequately disclosed, analyzed, or mitigated by
4 SDCI and the City's regulations do not adequately address or mitigate the environmental impacts of
5 this Proposal. He is expected to explain how the Proposal is inconsistent with the spirit and intent of
6 the height limit provision in the code.
7

8 Mr. Steinbrueck is also expected to testify about how the East Madison Street Proposal is
9 inconsistent with the Citywide Design Guidelines and SDCI and the Design Review Board misapplied
10 and misconstrued these Design Guidelines when it recommended approval of the Proposal. His
11 testimony is expected to provide facts and context for the argument that SDCI erred when it concluded
12 that the decision and recommendation of the Design Review Board was consistent with the Design
13 Guidelines. Mr. Steinbrueck's Curriculum Vitae is included in Appellant's exhibit list.
14

15 7. Tina Cohen. Ms. Cohen will testify as an expert witness about SEPA review, Design
16 Review, and code interpretations to the extent that they relate to tree and vegetation issues. She may
17 testify about the existing environment, the probable significant adverse impacts that will be caused by
18 the Proposal, and reasonable mitigation that should have been considered related to trees and
19 vegetation. She is expected to testify about how SDCI did not require or collect the correct, necessary
20 and adequate information upon which to make a determination on whether the East Madison Street
21 Proposal would have significant adverse impacts related to trees and vegetation. She is expected to
22 testify that the significant adverse environmental impacts related to trees and vegetation were not
23 adequately disclosed, analyzed, or mitigated by SDCI, that the City's regulations do not adequately
24 address or mitigate the environmental impacts of this Proposal, and that the mitigation proposed by
25 the Applicant and accepted by SDCI is not adequate.
26

1 Ms. Cohen is also expected to provide testimony that is relevant to the East Madison Street
2 Proposal is inconsistent with the Citywide Design Guidelines to the extent that trees or vegetation are
3 addressed by those Guidelines.

4 Ms. Cohen is also expected to provide expert information and opinion with respect to the
5 Appellant's contention that the East Madison Street Proposal is inconsistent with the tree removal
6 restrictions set forth in Ch. 25.11 SMC. She will provide facts and background to demonstrate why
7 the proposed removal of trees does not comply with the requirements set forth in SMC 25.11.040;
8 SMC 25.11.050; SMC 25.11.080; SMC 25.11.090. She will explain that the applicant did not
9 adequately identify the trees that are subject to the code limitations; did not demonstrate that removal
10 of trees is justified; did not meet the canopy replacement requirements in the code; and did not meet
11 the replacement and restoration requirements in the code. Ms. Cohen will testify that the mitigation
12 plan will not meet code requirements.

13 Ms. Cohen's Curriculum Vitae is included in the Appellants exhibit list.

14
15
16 8. Ross Tilghman. Mr. Tilghman is a transportation planner and owner of the Tilghman
17 Group. Mr. Tilghman will testify as an expert witness about Design Review, SEPA review, and code
18 interpretations to the extent that they relate to traffic and transportation issues. He is expected to testify
19 that SDCI did not require or collect the necessary and adequate information upon which to make a
20 determination on whether the East Madison Street Proposal would have significant adverse impacts
21 related to traffic and transportation. He is also expected to testify about the existing environment, the
22 probable significant adverse impacts that will be caused by the Proposal, and reasonable mitigation
23 that should have been considered related to traffic and transportation impacts. He will testify about
24 congestion and safety impacts on residential streets in the single family neighborhood adjacent to and
25 near the proposal and/or other streets at the top of the hill (including Madison and Lake Washington
26

1 Blvd.) and about how intersections in the area will be affected by the proposal. He will testify about
2 impacts that will result from the design and use of the commercial entrance on Madison. He will testify
3 about impacts associated with the access to the site to and from Dewey. He is expected to testify that
4 the significant adverse environmental impacts related to traffic and transportation impacts were not
5 adequately disclosed, analyzed, or mitigated by SDCI and the City's regulations do not adequately
6 address or mitigate the environmental impacts of this Proposal. He will also cover topics that were
7 set forth in letters that he prepared and submitted during the review process including issues with the
8 traffic report submitted by the applicant. Mr. Tilghman's Curriculum Vitae is included in the
9 Appellants exhibit list.
10

11 9. Tom Spangenberg. Mr. Spangenberg is a water resources engineer with 20 years of
12 experience in hydraulic, hydrologic, and drainage engineering involving, *inter alia*, combined systems
13 capacity analysis, urban stormwater infrastructure analysis, FEMA floodplain mapping, floodplain
14 restoration, and fish passage analysis. His technical expertise spans from conceptual design through
15 alternatives analysis, final design, and preparation of construction documents.
16

17 Mr. Spangenberg is expected to testify as an expert witness about adverse stormwater impacts
18 associated with the project and lack of reasonably sufficient information in support of the city's
19 threshold determination. Mr. Spangenberg's testimony is expected to include issues relating to the risk
20 of future flooding caused by adding more stormwater to the city's combined drainage system, impacts
21 on water quality in Lake Washington from combined sewer overflow events, the deadly storm event
22 and flooding of 2006, which took the life of one neighborhood resident, and impacts on groundwater
23 and sub-surface flow.
24

25 Mr. Spangenberg's Curriculum Vitae is included in the Appellants exhibit list.
26

1 10. Julius Schorzman. Mr. Schorzoman will testify about the design and construction of
2 the 3D model of the proposal, which is listed as an exhibit below.

3 11. Scott Maco, Director of Research and Development at the Davey Institute. Mr. Maco
4 leads development of the i-Tree Tools. If called, Mr. Maco would testify as an expert witness about
5 the benefits and value of the trees currently and how those benefits and values will be impacted by the
6 proposal. Mr. Maco's Curriculum Vitae is included in the Appellants exhibit list

7
8 12. Witnesses named by other parties in this matter.

9 Appellant reserves the right to call additional rebuttal witnesses; to supplement this disclosure
10 with witnesses and/or experts as the case is developed; to call records custodians to verify the
11 authenticity of records; to call any witnesses identified by other parties to this appeal and to call
12 rebuttal witnesses; and to call replacement witnesses if any of the witnesses identified above become
13 unavailable.
14

15 16 **II. EXHIBITS**

17 Appellant identifies the following exhibits it may use at the hearing in this matter:

18 1. All files and records that have been uploaded and are listed on the Project Portal
19 online for DCI Project No. 3020338-LU; DCI Project No. 3028345-IR; DCI Project No.; 6541076-
20 CN; DCI Project No. 6610469-CN. Those records can be accessed via
21 <http://web6.seattle.gov/dpd/edms/>
22

23 2. Screen shots of list of documents on the project portal for Project No. 3020338-LU.

24 3. All files and records that are listed in the Final SDCI List of Exhibits and Witnesses
25 (November 16, 2018).

26 4. Curriculum Vitae of Tom Spangenberg

- 1 5. Curriculum Vitae of Tina Cohen
- 2 6. Curriculum Vitae of Peter Steinbrueck
- 3 7. Curriculum Vitae of Ross Tilghman
- 4 8. Curriculum Vitae of Scott Maco
- 5 9. 2017 Seattle Rainfall.
- 6 10. Navix, Stormwater Drainage Report (Nov. 17, 2017)
- 7 11. CH2M Hill, Madison and Mercer/30th Flooding Investigation Findings Report (April
- 8 2007)
- 9 12. Northwest Hydraulic Consultants, Madison Valley In-Basin Analysis of Long-Term
- 10 Alternatives, Final Report (Oct. 2008)
- 11 13. Photos of 2006 flood event and damage
- 12 14. Profile Graphic
- 13 15. Email from Ross Tilghman to Magda Hogness (Jan. 18, 2017)
- 14 16. Memo from Ross Tilghman to Melissa Stoker (Sep. 9. 2016)
- 15 17. Memo from Ross Tilghman to Melissa Stoker (May 1, 2017)
- 16 18. Safe Routes to School Walking Map
- 17 19. Streets Illustrated Map
- 18 20. Trip rate comparison graphic
- 19 21. Map of affected intersections
- 20 22. PCC Truck Count
- 21 23. Turning Movement Traffic Study
- 22 24. AOE Graphic
- 23 25. South Elevation Graphic

- 1 26. Congrats? Seattle completes wettest four-year stretch in recorded history, Seattle
2 Times, Jan. 1, 2018.
- 3 27. Projected Climate Changes.
- 4 28. Letter from Claudia Newman to Magda Hogness and PRC re: comments on MUP
5 Application (May 23, 2017).
- 6 29. Request for Code Interpretation from Claudia Newman to SDCI (May 23, 2017)
- 7 30. Letter from Steinbrueck to DRB (Jul. 12, 2016)
- 8 31. 3D Model of the Proposal (photos of the model provided). This model is the same
9 model that was shown publicly at the Public Hearing put on by SDCI in June, 2017.
- 10 32. Tree Replacement calculations
- 11 33. Topographic site plan with tree labels incorporated
- 12 34. Site plan showing tree driplines, groves, and exceptional trees
- 13 35. Landscape Plans with green factor areas highlighted
- 14 36. Peter Steinbrueck EDG3 Public Comments (Jan. 27, 2017).
- 15 37. Letter from Matthew Patterson to the Seattle Design Review Board (Jul. 13, 2016)
- 16 38. Letter from Matthew Patterson to the Seattle Design Review Board (Oct. 21, 2016)
- 17 39. Annotated Environmental Checklist.
- 18 40. Plant Schedule Full Site.
- 19 41. State of Knowledge: Climate Change in Puget Sound, Nov. 2015.
- 20 42. Email between Scott Evans to Lucas Branham and Patrick Mahoney, last date
21 August 2, 2017, regarding 2939 Madison – sidewalk/street tree.
- 22 43. Google Earth Images.
- 23 44. Out on A Limb by Maria Dolan, Seattle Magazine, Oct., 2017.
- 24
25
26

- 1 45. E-mail Chain between Christina Legazpi and Emily Ehlers, et al., last date November
2 16, 2017 regarding Urban Forestry Recommendations.
- 3 46. Save Madison Valley Presentation.
- 4 47. Green Factor Score Sheet.
- 5 48. East Elevation – North End Sheet.
- 6 49. Stairway Improvement Photos.
- 7 50. Email chain between Cristofer Horbelt and Magda Hogness, last date April 19, 2017
8 regarding Capacity Analysis in Madison Valley.
- 9
- 10 51. What Killed Kate Fleming by Knute Berger, April 19, 2007.
- 11 52. Cornell Labs List of Neotropical Birds.
- 12 53. DSO Critical Areas Map.
- 13 54. DSO Water and Sewer Map.
- 14 55. ESA Habitat Report, May 23, 2017.
- 15 56. SMV Rebuttal to Keany memo (Vibrant Urban Corridor or Degraded Habitat Patch)
- 16 57. P-Patch Photos.
- 17 58. Madison Valley Overland Flow Paths.
- 18 59. Madison Valley “Mad-P,” Seattle Department of Neighborhoods.
- 19 60. Madison Valley Regional Hydraulic Model, SPU, July 2008.
- 20 61. Wasterwater Collection System: 2015 Annual Report, SPU (Mar. 28, 2016).
- 21 62. Photos of the site and surrounding area.
- 22 63. Elevation Contour Maps.
- 23 64. King County 2016 LIDAR.
- 24 65. Parks and Trails Map.
- 25
- 26


- 1 66. Zoning and Land Use Map.
- 2 67. Pikes/Pines – Where Does Capitol Hill’s Rainwater Go? Nov. 22, 2015.
- 3 68. Pikes/Pines – Rain, rain, don’t go away, but don’t wash crap in our waterways, Nov.
- 4 27, 2016.
- 5 69. Integrated Plan Alternative.
- 6 70. Sludge bugs: Sewage eating microbes in peril at crippled West Point Plant, Seattle
- 7 Times, Mar. 12, 2017.
- 8 71. Pushing for solutions after the West Point sewage spill, 03/16/2017.
- 9 72. Sewage Overflow Prevention (SPU).
- 10 73. Seattle CSO Locations.
- 11 74. State of the Birds 2014: Common Birds in Steep Decline List, the Cornell Lab of
- 12 Ornithology (Sep. 9, 2014).
- 13 75. Bird Photos.
- 14 76. The Valley View, June 2001.
- 15 77. The Valley View, November/December 2000.
- 16 78. The Valley View, September 2001.
- 17 79. Videos of the site and surrounding area. Appellants may also submit individual stills
- 18 from these videos.
- 19 80. Appellant may rely on and submit either portions of or the entire City of Seattle
- 20 Comprehensive Plan and Citywide Design Guidelines.
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26

In addition to the exhibits identified above, appellant reserves the right to introduce exhibits identified by any other party, to introduce additional exhibits as allowed by the City of Seattle Hearing Examiner Rules, and to introduce additional exhibits during cross-examination or rebuttal.

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
26

Dated this 20th day of November, 2018.

Respectfully submitted,
BRICKLIN & NEWMAN, LLP

By: 

Claudia M. Newman, WSBA No. 24928
Bryan Telegin, WSBA No. 46686
Attorneys for Save Madison Valley

**Telegin Declaration
Exhibit C**

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

ORDINANCE 118477

AN ORDINANCE adopting Initiative 42, enacting it as an ordinance of the City of Seattle.

WHEREAS, citizens of the City of Seattle circulated petitions seeking the enactment of Initiative 42 into law; and

WHEREAS, King County certified to the City of Seattle that Initiative 42 bore a sufficient number of validated signatures to qualify for transmittal to the City Council; and

WHEREAS, the City Council received Initiative 42 on December 16, 1996; and

WHEREAS, City Charter Article IV provides that the City Council may enact or reject such an initiative; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has, in Resolution 29521, stated it agrees with the general principles reflected in Initiative 42; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has, in Resolution 29521, directed the Department of Parks and Recreation to develop appropriate rules, policies, procedures, and guidelines to effectively implement Initiative 42; and

WHEREAS, section 4 of Initiative 42 states the initiated ordinance is to take effect "as provided by Article IV, Section 1 of the City Charter" but neither that nor any other part of the City Charter provides for the effective date of an ordinance adopted by the City Council, whether or not initiated by petition, and so to ensure that the Initiative takes effect the City Council has added section 5 to this ordinance to provide the normal and customary 30-day effective date; Now Therefore

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF SEATTLE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. All lands and facilities held now or in the future by The City of Seattle for park and recreation purposes, whether designated as park, park boulevard, or open space, shall be preserved for

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

1 such use; and no such land or facility shall be sold, transferred, or changed from park use to another
2 usage, unless the City shall first hold a public hearing regarding the necessity of such a transaction and
3 than enact an ordinance finding that the transaction is necessary because there is no reasonable and
4 practical alternative and the City shall at the same time or before receive in exchange land or a facility of
5 equivalent or better size, value, location and usefulness in the vicinity, serving the same community and
6 the same park purposes.

7 Section 2. Within thirty days of the effective date of such an ordinance, any person may seek
8 review in the Superior Court. The Superior Court shall set aside the proposed transaction if it is not
9 necessary or the proposed substitution is not equivalent or better than the park exchanged. The Superior
10 Court shall make its decision on the evidence as an issue of fact.

11 Section 3. Section 1 permits by duly enacted ordinance after a public hearing: a boundary
12 adjustment of equivalents with an adjoining owner; or the transfer of a joint use agreement with Seattle
13 School District No. 1 to another school site. Section 1 also permits by duly enacted ordinance after a
14 public hearing and without providing replacement property: a transfer to the federal, state, or county
15 governments for park and recreation uses; the reversion of right-of-way continuously owned by a City
16 utility; the opening of an unimproved street for street use; a sub-surface or utility easement compatible
17 with park use; and franchises or concessions that further the public use and enjoyment of a park.

18 Section 4. This ordinance shall take effect as provided by Article IV, Section 1 of the City
19 Charter. However, if the City should sell, transfer, or change the use to a non-park use of any park
20 property held on or after May 17, 1996 (including Bradner Playfield), the City shall replace it in kind
21 with equivalent or better property or facilities in the same vicinity, serving the same community, unless
22
23
24

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

1 the City has already received as good or better land and facilities for park use in the same vicinity,
2 serving the same community, in exchange for that transaction.

3 Section 5. This ordinance shall take effect and be in force thirty (30) days from and after its
4 approval by the Mayor, but if not approved and returned by the Mayor within ten (10) days after
5 presentation, it shall take effect as provided by Municipal Code Section 1.04.020.

6 Passed by the City Council the 27 day of January, 1997, and signed by me in open
7 session in authentication of its passage this 27 day of January, 1997.

8
9 Jan Prago
President _____ of the City Council

10 Approved by me this 4 day of February, 1997.
11
12 Norman B. Rice
Mayor

13
14 Filed by me this _____ day of _____, 1997.
15
16 Juana E. Pappan
City Clerk

17 (Seal)

18
19
20
21
22
23
24

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

**Telegin Declaration
Exhibit D**

GROUP SEEKS PARK PROTECTION - INITIATIVE WOULD BAR SALES WITHOUT HEARING

Seattle Times, The (WA) (Published as THE SEATTLE TIMES) - August 1, 1996

Author/Byline: CHARLES E. BROWN, SEATTLE TIMES STAFF REPORTER

Edition: FINAL

Section: LOCAL NEWS

Page: B3

A group of Seattle residents is pushing for a law that would make it impossible for the city to surrender public property for private use without public approval.

Yesterday, the group, which calls itself the Protect Our Parks Initiative Committee, held a news conference in the South Atlantic Street neighborhood to kick off a campaign to gather signatures to get such a measure on the ballot. The group registered with the city clerk's office two months ago.

As proposed, Initiative 42 would give the public more say in protecting parks and open space, said initiative committee co-chairwoman Bonnie Heaven, who also is president of the South Atlantic Street Community Association.

Initiative 42 would require a public hearing before city government could divert parkland. It also would require a finding by the City Council that no reasonable or practical alternatives exist before parkland could be sold or swapped for any nonpark use. And it would require the city to provide equal or better parkland or recreation facilities in the event of a land swap.

Three of the four initiative committee co-chairs are South Atlantic Street residents who are protesting a recommendation by Mayor Norm Rice to sell part of Bradner Playfield, a neighborhood lot now under Seattle Parks Department jurisdiction, to private developers for middle-income, single-family homes. The playfield is at 29th Avenue South and South Grand Street.

Heaven's South Atlantic Street Community Association and several neighborhood residents have lobbied the mayor to allow the entire 1.6-acre Bradner site to be devoted to a community garden and recreation space.

"Our neighborhoods believe that parkland is owned by the people, the citizens of Seattle," said Heaven. "On one hand, Initiative 42 has grown out of the struggle to save Bradner Park.

"On the other hand, the fate of Bradner Park is in itself a citywide concern. If one piece of this park is sold, it will set the precedent that parks in Seattle can be sold despite overwhelming community opposition."

Besides Heaven, the initiative committee co-chairs are neighbors Kendra Friday and Dan Stecher, and Dorothy Douglas, a North Seattle resident.

The group hopes to gather at least 18,323 signatures of registered city voters - the minimum number needed to qualify Initiative 42 for the ballot - by Nov. 20. Heaven said the measure likely would not be placed on a ballot before fall 1997.

Record: 2342020

Copyright: Copyright 1996 The Seattle Times
