EXHIBIT 20
PAGE 1 OF 8

November 5, 2014

Jenny Ngo
City of Woodinville
17301-133rd Avenue NE
Woodinville, WA 98072

RE: Additional Information Request for Church Subdivision (PPA14001/SEP14017)
Location: 20325 136th Ave NE/13457 NE 205th Street
Parcel #, 032659049/0326059095
Blueline Job No. 14-175

Ms. Ngo:

This letter is in response to your review of the Church Subdivision project. The plans and report have been revised according to the comments redlined on the plans and report dated August 19, 2014. Below is a list of each comment with our responses in bold.

PLANNING

Land Use

1. The location of setbacks and easements is unclear on Lot 11. It appears that there is an easement running through the eastern 15 feet of the property and two setbacks on the south side of the lot. Pursuant to WMC 20.06.040(7), the front lot line shall be the property line(s) separating the lot from a street or vehicle access corridor. Lot 11 does not appear to comply with this requirement. The front lot line for Lot 11 should be located on the south side of the parcel (see Comment 2 for NE 205th Street).
Labeled the setbacks on PP-01 to clarify.

2. Lots 11 through 14 are located adjacent to a public street and a 10-foot wide minimum setback from the street applies consistent with WMC 21.12.050. Please indicate the required 10-foot setback on the plans to show that the lots comply with this street setback requirement.
Dimension on sheet PP-01 shows the required 10' setback.

3. Lot 7 and Lot 14 does not meet the required minimum lot width at street of 50 feet. Pursuant to WMC 21.06.375.0020, if the front lot line is a curve, the lot width at street is measured "parallel to the tangent thereof, and at a distance from the front lot line equal to the depth of the required front yard." It appears that the Lot 7 has a lot width of 43 feet and Lot 14 has a lot width of 20 feet when measured using this method.
Lots have been modified to meet the minimum lot width.

4. The east boundary of Tract 996 should be consistent with the stream buffer pursuant to WMC 21.24.180. Please be aware that if the 75-foot stream buffer is maintained, the edge of the buffer will be the new boundary of the NGPE. See Comments 5 through 7 regarding the buffer reduction request.
See Raedeke Associates response attached.

RECEIVED
NOV 05 2014
CITY OF WOODINVILLE
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

5. When revising plans, make certain lot width dimension circles are contained within the lots they are meant to measure. Dimension circles extending beyond the boundary of the lots do not allow for an accurate reading.
   The circles have been relocated within the lots.

Critical Areas

The analysis and conclusions in the Critical Areas Assessment are unclear and do not substantiate a buffer reduction to 50 feet. The report should be revised to be consistent with the requirements of Chapter 21.24 WMC.

6. Page 6 of the Critical Area Assessment states that "Raedeke Associates, Inc. did not identify or delineate any wetlands on the property." However, Sheet 2 of the Preliminary Plat Map identifies wetland flags along in Tract 996 as a wetland. The Priority Habitat and Species Map identifies a significant wetland directly to the north of the property. Please clarify this discrepancy and include documentation consistent with standard wetland delineation practices as stated on page 4 of the report.
   See Raedeke Associates response attached.

7. Page 10 of the Critical Area Assessment states that the "stream along the west property boundary will likely be considered a Type 3 stream" (emphasis added). The report must clearly provide information on the stream, including the top of the bank and/or ordinary high water mark, and establish a stream typing consistent with WMC 21.24.370. The buffer should be established based on this information. The report should provide information that evaluates the stream for the presence of fish including salmonid species. Include field reports or any information that was generated as a part of field work to support this finding.
   See Raedeke Associates response attached.

8. In order to demonstrate that a reduced buffer is appropriate, the following must be included in the report consistent with WMC 21.24.380(1):
   a. Additional information and evidence supporting that the stream is significantly degraded.
   b. Detailed information on the proposed mitigation. An explanation on how the mitigation is consistent with WMC 21.24.400 should be included.
   c. An analysis of the mitigation demonstrating that it will provide a net improvement in overall stream and buffer function and value.
   d. Provide information related to maintenance, monitoring, contingency plans and bonding measures.

   See Raedeke Associates response attached

9. It appears that there are slopes on the property that are at least 40 percent and have a vertical relief of 10 feet or more, which are steep slopes and qualify as a landslide hazard area (Sheets 2 and 3). The geotechnical report states that there are no steep slopes or landslide hazard areas present on the site. Please review the criteria for landslide hazard area designation pursuant to WMC 21.24.390 and provide a response in the geotechnical report. Include the following information:
   a. Areas with slopes greater than 40 percent should be identified on a site plan in the report and in the preliminary plat documents, including top and toe of slope.
   b. Buffers from the landslide hazard area should be established based on WMC 21.24.310. A buffer reduction may be allowed under subsection (1)(a)(ii) for landslide hazard areas if the proposal demonstrates that there will be adequate protection for surrounding development and the critical area.
   c. Demonstrate compliance with the design standards outlined in 21.24.310(1)(c).
      See Terra Associates response in Section 4.3 in the attached report.

Trees and Landscaping

10. Pursuant to WMC 2.24.100, street trees shall be planted at a spacing of 1 tree per 25 feet. Please revise the landscaping plans to show the updated tree spacing.
    Street tree spacing has been adjusted to 1 tree per 25 feet.

11. The submitted tree credit calculations, tree replacement data, and tree evaluation data are inconsistent and incorrect among the submitted plans and reports. Please review the following:
    a. Please update the plans and report so that the total site area is consistent. The plat indicates that the site is 2.98 acres, while the tree plan and arborist report indicates 2.97 acres. This results in a slight difference in total tree credit requirements.
       Site area on the plans and arborist report has been coordinated.

    b. The report and landscape plans are inconsistent regarding trees retention and tree density calculations. The Tree Replacement Data table on Sheet L1.01 of the plans identify 51.7 tree credits from existing trees in the NGPE and 74.3 tree credits from existing trees on the lots to be retained. However, in the Tree Evaluation Data on Sheet L1.02 and at the end of the arborist report indicates that 66.7 tree credits entirely within the NGPE will be retained and no trees on the future lots will be kept. Please clarify which trees are being retained and provide consistent calculations across all documents.
       Tree retention, tree density and credit calculations have been coordinated on the plans and arborist report.

    c. Trees that are being planted in the NGPE may be used as part of the tree density credit calculations. If you wish to use new tree credits from the new trees, please provide the quantity and location of those trees on the landscape plans.
       Yes, trees are proposed to be added to the NGPA for tree credits. These trees are shown on the plan and the quantity indicated in the summary calculations.

12. When revising plans, please include a standard and legible graphic scale on the landscape plans.
    Graphic scale added to plans.

13. Please provide symbols for all trees on the plant legend on Sheet 1.01 of the plans.
    Plant list has been amended with specific symbols for each tree type.

14. The tree and planting plan (Sheet L1.101) is inconsistent with Sheet 7 of the preliminary plat. Trees that are shown as preserved on the tree and planting plan are shown as not protected on Sheet 7. These plans are also inconsistent with the arborist report (see Comment 11i above).
    Plant list has been amended with specific symbols for each tree type.

15. Please provide a revised copy of the Tree Evaluation Data tables (at the end of the Arborist Report) so that the Action column is legible.
    Revised spreadsheet has been provided.

16. The Arborist Report essentially identifies all trees outside the NGPE as Type 3 trees. Type 3 trees are trees that are (a) not viable, or (b) is in an area where removal is unavoidable due to the anticipated development activity. The Tree Evaluation Data table shows that many trees slated for removal are viable, healthy trees. Additionally, the preliminary grading plans show that these trees will not be significantly affected by grading activities. Revise the plans and report to protect trees that are outside of anticipated development activity or provide additional information that justifies the removal of these trees consistent with WMC 21.15.060.
    Trees outside the NGPA to be removed are expected to be affected by the anticipated development activities including grading and the installation of road and utilities. The affects trees are listed as Type 3 as they are in an area where removal is unavoidable due to anticipated development activity.

17. Please provide information on what is being proposed in the stormwater tract in terms of landscaping or recreational space. Pursuant to WMC 20.06.170, all subdivisions are required to provide on-site recreation and trail corridors.
On site recreation design has been added to the plans.

PUBLIC WORKS

SEPA

18. The SEPA checklist and TIR are incomplete as they both state that the path for water runoff, including storm, will be discharged to the existing downstream conveyance system to Little Bear Creek. Sheet 5 of 7 of the plan set states that the downstream culvert was not found and that it might even be buried. Without verifying the location or existence of the downstream culvert there is no way to confirm where water from the site will actually go. The applicant needs to find and address the outfall condition as additional water may require erosion control measures to be installed at this outfall to prevent scouring.
The location of the downstream culvert has now been located and verified, and the TIR downstream analysis has been updated accordingly.

19. Sheet 3 of 7 identifies steep slopes on the property. The geotechnical report will need to identify what the buffer is for the steep slopes in the NGPE for building houses. Will the steep slopes along NE 205th St be stable enough to cut for installation of a wall?
The geotechnical report has been revised to address the encroachments into the steep slope areas.

20. Block walls shown along NE 205th St and 136th Ave NE are shown with elevations ranging up to 20-ft in height. The City strongly recommends lowering these walls to a max height of 12-ft to reduce the significant visual impact of a 20-ft high wall. The location of the detention vault may conflict with the tails of a block wall. A different wall type may need to be used.
Grading has been revised to reduce wall heights to the maximum extent feasible.

21. The Transportation Impact Analysis included an intersection sight distance and stopping sight distance analysis that did not take into account the vertical curve. Please submit an updated analysis after review.
Transportation Impact Analysis has been updated to include site and stopping distance.

Construction

Staff identified the additional information or revisions that need to be clarified prior to finalizing the construction permits. Although this information is not necessary for processing the preliminary plat application, we have included this information as it may change the layout and design of the plat.

22. There appears to be one or several wells on the site. Plans should show the location and procedure per WAC 332-17-310.
Noted added to sheet TP-01.

23. Water valves are shown in the same location as a gas line on NE 205th St.
Gas line shown on drawings as surveyed, per field locate paint lines.

24. A fence needs to be placed along the NGPE and the resident's property line with signs identifying the area.
Fence and signs have been added and called out on sheet PP-01.

25. The Transportation Impact Analysis does not include a vertical sight distance analysis, please submit.
Transportation Impact Analysis has been updated to include site and stopping distance.

26. The street planter is required around the outside of the cul-de-sac with a 6-ft sidewalk on the backside of the planter.
    A variance request was submitted with our initial submittal; however, the site plan has been revised to include a planter and 5' sidewalk around the cul-de-sac.

27. A 20-ft diameter landscape island shall be placed in the middle of the cul-de-sac.
    Landscape Island has been added per City of Woodinville standard detail 314.

28. The radii on the cul-de-sac transitions that are currently shown as 25-ft shall be increased to 28-ft to meet IFC2009 requirements.
    Radius on the cul-de-sac has been increased to 28'.

29. Rolled curb will not be allowed in the cul-de-sac.
    Plans revised accordingly.

30. Show the location of driveway transitions.
    Plans revised accordingly.

31. All planters and landscape islands in the ROW shall require permanent irrigation.
    Note added to sheet PP-01.

32. Street trees shall be placed at 25-ft OC along the public roadway. Verify at intersections that street trees do not interfere with sight distance requirements.
    Note added to sheet PP-01.

33. Root barriers are required to be installed on all trees located adjacent to the public roadway, include a detail of the root barrier and installation.
    Landscape plan details have been updated to address this issue.

34. Several locations shall require "No Parking" signs to be installed
    Shown on sheet PP-01.

35. The cul-de-sac will require four signs
    Shown on sheet PP-01.

36. One side of Road A will need to be signed no parking, which side?
    Shown on sheet PP-01, north/east side will be no parking.

37. All walls over 4-ft in height will require a separate building permit.
    Noted.

38. There will need to be a fence placed at the top of the walls.
    Noted.

39. Existing overhead utilities will need to be undergrounded per WMC 15.39.
    Noted added to sheet PP-01.

40. Just south of Road A, the alignment of the sidewalk along 136th Ave NE should be altered to keep the planter width constant. A slight jog in the sidewalk will be installed to connect to the current sidewalk at the very end.
    Road was increased to 21' to avoid the jog and matches existing.

41. At the southeast corner of the property an additional ADA ramp is required to connect with the adjacent roadway to the east of the subdivision.
    Plans revised accordingly.

42. At the intersection of NE 205th St. and 136th Ave NE make the following changes:
    a. Dimension the radius to be 40-ft
    Plans revised accordingly.

    b. Additional concrete sidewalk is required as shown on the plans, shaded in blue. The corner should match that of Road A and 136th Ave NE, with an increased radius.
    Plans revised accordingly.
    c. A 5.5-ft wide planter is required along NE 205th St with a 6-ft sidewalk on the backside of the planter.
    Shown in plan and section.

43. Show the location of the mailbox and get approval from the post master.
    Mailbox approval is in process.

44. Where will the existing mailbox for the adjacent subdivision be relocated?
    Relocated as close to the same location.

45. In the northwest corner of the subdivision the existing culvert will need to be extended underneath the engineered wall.
    Shown and called out.

46. There is 310-ft between CB's on NE 205th St, provide an analysis that confirms if a 25-year storm will not exceed the inlet capacity. An additional CB may be needed.
    291' between catch basin's with updates to curb return radius.

47. All roadway sections need to be revised, please see redlines.
    Plans revised according to redlines.

48. A separate building permit for the detention vault is required. The applicant should also include a detail showing the location of the access hatches.
    Noted, will be provided

49. The landscaping plan shows street trees in the roadway.
    Trees have been relocated to the planter strip.

50. Please address the alignment of 136th Ave NE as there appears to be a bend in the roadway.
    No jog in the alignment was found.

51. Please address the alignment of 205th St as there appears to be a bend in the roadway.
    No jog in the alignment was found.

52. All new transformers, utilities, and apparatuses shall be installed below ground per WMC 15.39.
    Note added to the plans.

53. Show the underground location for power vaults on the plans.
    Noted, to be provided during final engineering review.

54. Add a note to the plans stating that all new utilities will be installed underground per WMC 15.39.
    Note added to sheet PP-01.

55. A separate plan with a light level analysis and street light locations is required.
    Lighting analysis has been complete and is attached to each plan set.

UTILITIES

56. The applicant should graphically indicate placement and size of all culverts on submitted plans.
    Existing culverts are shown graphically per size and placement.

FIRE

Fire comments are pending.

BUILDING

57. Fire hydrant locations are required on the plans demonstrating compliance with IFC (2012 Appendix C and D).
    Fire hydrant locations are shown on GP-01.

AGENCY(S) COMMENTS

Please review the attached comments from the following agencies:

1. Muckleshoot Indian Tribe, email dated August 19, 2014
    a. Is the stream fish bearing?
       See Raedeke Associates response attached.

    b. The TIR indicates that the existing culvert on NE 205th Street has a split in the pipe and is leaking water (Page 3-6). The condition and size of that culvert may be causing a fish-passage barrier and as such, it should be replaced as part of the project since the NE 205th Street improved as part of the project?
       The 'split' portion of the pipe is located within private property. The project will not increase flows to this pipe; therefore, the project does not anticipate to create a drainage issue at this location. No existing drainage issues have been noted at this location. This portion of the stream is not considered fish bearing per the revised Critical Areas report prepared by Raedeke Associates dated November 4, 2014. Therefore, the pipe section will not be replaced as part of this project.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Please review the attached comments from the public. Provide a response to the following issues that were raised:

1. Julia Schroeder, email dated August 13, 2014
    a. There is the large Cedar tree over our back fence in the proposed project site. Will the tree be retained and is it going to be a danger to her home?
       According to the arborist Tony Shoffner, the current version of the site plan shows this tree, #7172 a 40" dbh western red cedar, to be retained. At the time of my assessment, I found this tree to be in good condition and health, however, I have not inspected the tree since that time, so I cannot comment on its current health and condition. Given the exposure, it is likely that this tree will lose limbs during strong winds, however, branch loss is not considered a high risk as a danger to their home. However, I have not confined the condition since my initial assessment after grading to confirm that the roots have or have not be damaged.

2. Brian Heath, email dated August 13, 2014
    a. Will this development have a retention pond?
       No, a detention vault is proposed.

    b. Do they plan to leave any of three that currently run along the back fence?
       The current tree retention plan includes the retention of 3 trees along the south property line.

3. Lani Savage-Leuchs, email dated August 13, 2014
   a. Treacherous corner at 136/205?
      Please see Transpo response attached.

   b. Will sidewalk be provided around the corner of 136/205?
      Sidewalk is proposed along the corner of 136th and 205th as shown on the preliminary plans.

   c. Decrease Traffic Speed along 205?
      Please see Transpo response attached.

   d. Impacts on the landscaping and stream running though the property?
      The stream and a stream buffer will be preserved within a Native Growth Protection Area tract. The project does not anticipate significant impacts the stream.

4. Dianna Galante, email dated August 15, 2014
   a. Mitigation to control erosion onto the streams that are nearby?
      See Raedeke Associates response attached.

   b. Mitigation to project second growth forest trees to the southwest of the development?
      The arborist, Tony Shoffner is not aware of a second growth forest to the southwest of the property. An aerial image shows a small stand of what appears to be red alders to the southwest of the project site. As far as I understand the WMC, there is no requirement for mitigation to protect off-site trees, particularly those that do not have crowns that extend onto the project site. I don't know what would constitute mitigation for off-site trees.

Please call or email me with any questions or concerns at (425) 216-4051 x225 or gtamble@thebluelinegroup.com.

THE BLUELINE GROUP

Geoff Tamble, PE
Principal