JUDGE: DOUGLASS A. NORTH 1 COURTROOM: **ROOM C-203** 2 **HEARING TIME:** 10:00 AM **HEARING DATE: DECEMBER 14, 2018** 3 4 5 6 7 8 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON 9 FOR THE COUNTY OF KING 10 S 212th ST LLC, a Washington limited liability NO. 18-2-55191-9 SEA company, 11 DECLARATION OF SIDDHARTH 12 Plaintiff, JHA IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION 13 v. 14 FORTERRA NW, a Washington public benefit nonprofit corporation, and FORTERRA 15 ENTERPRISES, INC., a Washington corporation, 16 Defendants. 17 I, Siddharth Jha, declare as follows: 18 I am over the age of 18 years and competent to testify as follow: 19 I am a Managing Director for S 212th St LLC, a Washington limited liability company 1. 20 ("Company"). 21 2. Attached as **Exhibit A** is a true and correct copy of the Vacant Land Purchase and 22 Sale Agreement ("Agreement") for the purchase, sale and deed to Plaintiff property legally described 23 in the Complaint as property owned by Defendants. 24 Attached as **Exhibit B** is a true and correct copy of Form 34 of the Agreement, 3. 25 extending the Feasibility Period (defined under Section 15 of the Agreement) for 30-business days. Fox Rothschild LLP

DECLARATION OF SIDDHARTH JHA - 1

183715\00001\80893265.v1

1001 FOURTH AVENUE, SUITE 4500

SEATTLE, WA 98154 206.624.3600

- 4. Attached as **Exhibit C** is a true and correct copy of Form 34 of the Agreement, extending the Feasibility Period until October 11, 2018.
- 5. Attached as **Exhibit D** is a true and correct copy of Form 34 of the Agreement, extending the Feasibility Period until November 21, 2018.
- 6. Attached as **Exhibit E** is a true and correct copy of Form 34 of the Agreement, extending the Feasibility Period until December 5, 2018.
- 7. Attached as **Exhibit F** is a true and correct copy of an email I sent on behalf of the Company on May 27, 2018 to Thai Nguyen, the real estate broker representing the Company, seeking clarification on numerous missing and incomplete documents we believe Defendants failed to provide.
- 8. Attached as **Exhibit G** is a true and correct copy of an email sent by Lindsay Weimer, who forwarded me the June 20, 2018 email by Darcey Hughes, Senior Project Manager for Forterra, which Ms. Hughes wrote in response to my May 27, 2018 email. The documents provided by way of Ms. Hughes's June 20, 2018 email were transmitted to the Company on June 21, 2018— the 50th day of the 67-day Feasibility Period, and 43 days after the Document Due Date (defined in the Complaint as May 9, 2018).
- 9. Attached as **Exhibit H** is a true and correct copy of a letter I sent on August 16, 2018 on behalf of the Company to Forterra, outlining in detail various documents we believe were missing, incomplete or otherwise hadn't been provided by Forterra—even after Forterra shared additional documents by way of its June 20, 2018 email (*Exhibit G*).
- 10. Attached as **Exhibit I** is a true and correct copy of various emails I received on August 21 and 22 from Adam Draper, Forterra's former Corporate Counsel, in response to my August 16, 2018 letter (*Exhibit H*) stating that (1) Forterra had conducted a diligent search, (2) provided all documents in its possession, and (3) had no additional documents it could provide the Company.
- 11. Attached as **Exhibit J** is a true and correct copy of various emails between Dan Grausz, Senior Director of Strategic Projects for Forterra; Kristen Karabensh, current Corporate **Fox Rothschild LLP**

Counsel for Forterra; Darcey Hughes; Wendy Lyon, the Company's trial counsel, and myself. Mr. Grausz's November 16, 2018 email to Ms. Lyon, Ms. Karabensh, Ms. Hughes and myself stated in relevant part:

Forterra has searched multiple times for documents that your client appears to believe that we have. We do not have them nor am I aware of any other Property Documents (as that term is defined in the PSA) that are in our possession.

- 12. Attached as **Exhibit K** is a true and correct copy of part of a land use permit application with the City of Kent ("City") for a Pre-Application Conference that Forterra submitted to the City ("Application"). The Application was obtained from the City under the City's file number PA-2014-31.
- 13. Attached as **Exhibit L** is a true and correct copy of the Application's attendance sheet for the meeting that occurred at the City. This document was obtained through a public records request to the City.
- 14. Attached as **Exhibit M** is a true and correct copy of the City's follow-up letter to Forterra after the meeting that occurred at the City. This document was obtained through a public records request to the City.
- 15. Attached as **Exhibit N** is a true and correct copy of the City's Notice of Application and Proposed Determination of Nonsignificance for the City's project no. ENV-2016-10 under application name "S 212th St Erosion Repairs", a City public works project that directly relates to the Property as work was done on and around the Property. This document was obtained through a public records request to the City.
- 16. Attached as **Exhibit O** is a true and correct copy of the City's Environmental Checklist Application Form for the City's project no. ENV-2016-10 under application name "S 212th St Erosion Repairs", a City public works project that is material to the Property as work was done on and around the Property. This document was obtained through a public records request to the City.
 - 17. Attached as **Exhibit P** is a true and correct copy of an appraisal of the Property

183715\00001\80893265.v1

prepared by Integra Realty Resources on September 16, 2016 for the City.

- 18. Attached as **Exhibit Q** is a true and correct copy of a one (1) page environmental diagram produced by Environmental Science Associates ("ESA") in or around 2012 under project name "Forterra Wetland Assessment" and ESA job no. "120085".
- 19. Attached as **Exhibit R** is a true and correct copy of a one (1) page environmental diagram produced by Environmental Science Associates ("ESA") in or around 2012 under project name "Forterra Wetland Assessment" and ESA job no. "120085" that contains additional depictions regarding a proposed development area and a proposed trail system. Exhibit Q and Exhibit R are two different versions of what appears to be the same document.
- 20. Attached as **Exhibit S** is a true and correct copy of a lien for special connection charges by Soos Creek Water and Sewer District in the amount of \$104,810.00, recorded on November 19, 2015 under King County Recording No. 20151119000429.
- 21. Attached as **Exhibit T** is a true and correct copy of a Developer Extension Reimbursement Agreement with the Soos Creek Water and Sewer District in the amount of \$112,907.51, recorded on November 19, 2015 under King County Recording No. 20151119000431.
- 22. Attached as **Exhibit U** is a true and correct copy of Form 17C, the Seller's Disclosure Statement, executed by Michelle Connor, Forterra's current CEO, on February 1, 2017 and provided to the Company in connection with the Property's sale.
- 23. Attached as **Exhibit V** is a true and correct copy of an April 30, 2018 preliminary commitment for title insurance from First American Title Insurance Company for the Property and naming the Company as the proposed insured.
- 24. Attached as **Exhibit W** is a true and correct copy of Form 34 of the Agreement, extending the Feasibility Period until December 14, 2018.
- 25. Attached as **Exhibit X** is a true and correct copy of a letter dated November 30, 2018 from the Company's trial counsel to Forterra outlining possible next steps to avoid further litigation after a meeting at Forterra's office on November 28, 2018 between Mr. Grausz, Ms. Karabensh, Ms.

FOX ROTHSCHILD LLP

10

9

12

13

11

14

16

15

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

26

Hughes, Ms. Lyon and myself.

- 26. Attached as **Exhibit Y** is a true and correct copy of a December 1, 2018 email from Mr. Grausz in response to the letter dated November 30, 2018 from the Company's trial counsel. Mr. Grausz's response confirms that, at the very least, Forterra has additional documents in its possession that fall within the scope of Property Documents that it has not yet provided.
- 27. On November 28, 2018, Ms. Lyon and I met with Forterra and its representatives at its offices in Seattle, Washington. In the meeting, Forterra described the search process it undertook to locate documents and what documents, if any, it had not provided the Company. Forterra showed us several documents it did not provide based solely on its own subjective belief that some documents were "not relevant to the Property's development". In my opinion, the documents Forterra has not provided to date, are documents that relate to the Property and would be important in our evaluation of any future development.
- 28. Some of the documents Forterra has failed to provide include, but are not limited to, environmental evaluations, scope of work for various environmental evaluations, and other environmental maps and site plans. In addition to the documents themselves, Forterra has other, supplemental documents in its possession that (1) relate to the Property and (2) are necessary to comprehend the other documents produced. For example, Forterra repeatedly averred that the document under Exhibit Q is only one page, however, despite producing another version of the one page, which varies from the one page the produced later (*Exhibit R*), Forterra refuses to provide the scope of work or contract it entered into with ESA for commissioning the one page. The scope of work and contract would provide valuable insight as to how the one page was created, and provide the Company with necessary information to determine how the Property was evaluated by ESA. Without the scope of work and contract—which Forterra admits it has readily in its possession—the Company is disadvantaged as no other documents in Forterra's possession would help explain the one page produced by ESA. Without it, it is difficult, if not impossible, to determine the parameters used by ESA in producing the one page—leaving the Company in a position that is no better than not

FOX ROTHSCHILD LLP

DECLARATION OF SIDDHARTH JHA - 6

having the one page altogether.

- 29. Based on my understanding of the documents Forterra identified (but would not produce) at the meeting, Forterra has a wide range of highly relevant Property Documents that it has not provided. For example, Forterra stated it was required to grant the City a Temporary Construction Easement ("TCE") in connection with the S 212th St Erosion Project under the City's file no. ENV-2016-10. Forterra also stated the TCE was negotiated for and executed by Adam Draper, Forterra's former counsel. However, Forterra also admitted that despite searching Mr. Draper's emails, it found no results relating to the TCE. It seems implausible that no written communications exist when taking into consideration Forterra's other averments that Mr. Draper communicated with and granted the City a TCE for work in connection with the S 212th St Erosion Project.
- 30. Despite repeated requests, Forterra has failed to provide a copy of the TCE. During the November 28 meeting, Forterra also stated that "it did not believe the TCE had anything to do with the Property's development." The TCE granted to the City for work the City actually performed on and around the Property is relevant to the Property, and falls within the purview of the Property Documents, as defined in Section 4 of the Agreement. Forterra's opinion of the TCE's materiality to future development is irrelevant to its obligation to produce, and Forterra is incorrect. Without reviewing the TCE, the Company is unable to determine what work was done by the City, the extent and magnitude of said work, along with the purposes for granting the TCE. Absent review of the TCE, as is the case with several other documents, the Company cannot fully investigate matters relating to the Property.
- 31. Despite repeated requests, Forterra has only offered to allow Plaintiff to review a few select documents from the "Green Folder," and will only allow that limited review if the Company waives its right to production of all other Property Documents. The Company has not waived its rights and is entitled to all documents in the "Green Folder," which Forterra identified as including: temporary access easement(s) related to the First/Second Erosion Projects; steep slope and hazardous areas maps; various studies, reports, diagrams, maps, and photos of the Property produced by several

FOX ROTHSCHILD LLP 1001 FOURTH AVENUE, SUITE 4500

SEATTLE, WA 98154 206.624.3600

183715\00001\80893265.v1

engineering and environmental consultants, including Barghausen Engineering; agreements and contracts with consultants, including, the scope of work for work done by ESA and EAI; the Property's site plans; printed email and letter correspondences with the City and with the donor who deeded the Property; draft agreements and proposals for potential joint ventures; internal correspondences and Forterra's board resolutions related to the Property; property management agreements with neighbors about the Property's temporary use; preliminary title reports; invoices and schedule of signage revenue associated with the Property; and another copy of the one page ESA report (*Exhibit Q*).

32. During the November 28 meeting, Forterra stated it believed the language used in the Agreement was not akin to standard language used in the real estate industry, and as a result, the forgoing documents were exempt from the purview of Property Documents. I expressed to Forterra that I disagreed with that assessment because the language in the Form 34 controls regardless of what Forterra believes is "standard," and because the Form 34 language is in fact similar to the language used in the "standard" Commercial Broker's Association Purchase and Sale Agreement CBA Form PS_1A. The two are compared side by side on the next page.

9 | | ///

 $21 \left| \left| \right|_{////} \right|$

 $3 \|_{/\!/\!/\!/}$

6

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

2324

25

26

Language Used in the Agreement

Language Used in CBA Form PS_1A

COVENANT TO **SELLER'S COOPERATE** \mathbf{BY} **PROVIDING DOCUMENTS:** Within 5 days following Mutual Acceptance, Seller shall provide Buyer with copies of all contracts, documents, reports, and studies relating to the Property and its development, for Buyer's information and review ("Property Documents"). If Seller has any engineering drawings and documents, environmental diagrams and studies, surveys, and other Property Documents for some or all of the Property in its possession, Seller shall deliver copies of such contracts, documents, reports, and studies to Buyer no later than 5 days following Mutual Acceptance.

Seller shall make available for inspection by Buyer and its agents within _____ days (2 days if not filled in) after Mutual Acceptance all documents in Seller's possession or control relating to the ownership, operation, renovation or development of the Property, excluding appraisals or other statements of value, and including: statements for real estate taxes, assessments, and utilities for the last three years and year to date; property management agreements and any other agreements with professionals or consultants; leases or other agreements relating to occupancy of all or a portion of the Property and a suite-by-suite schedule of tenants, rents, prepaid rents, deposits specifications, fees; plans, applications, drawings, surveys, and studies; maintenance records, accounting records and audit reports for the last three years and year to date; and "Vendor Contracts" which shall include maintenance or service contracts, and installments purchase contracts or leases of personal property or fixtures used in connection with the Property.

33. Forterra's refusal to provide Property Documents not only hinders the Company's ability to conduct due diligence as described above, but also is inconsistent with other provisions of the Agreement. For example, paragraph 5 of Form 34 of the Agreement requires, that at the Company's request, an assignment of all "studies, reports, surveys, design documents, warranties, permits, licenses, and any and all other materials or documents that are related to the Property or its development, and related efforts. Without disclosure of such documents, it is impossible for the Company to decide whether to seek an assignment of them. In addition Section U of the Agreement reads, "Seller shall cooperate with Buyer in obtaining permits or other approvals Buyer may reasonably require for Buyer's intended use of the Property...". Without the Property Documents,

FOX ROTHSCHILD LLP

the Company cannot discern what permits or other approvals it may need Forterra to cooperate with. *Exhibit A*.

34. On or about December 7, 2018, our Company will be filing a public records request with the City in an attempt to locate various Property Documents we believe Forterra has failed to produce.

Under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington, I declare the foregoing to be true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Executed this 6th day of December, 2018 at Seattle, Washington.

Siddharth Jha

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

2	I hereby certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that				
3	on the date written below, I caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing to be delivered to the				
4	following parties in the manner indicated:				
5	Name: Law Firm:	Dan Grausz, Forterra		Via electronic mail per agreement Via U.S. Mail	
7	Address: Address:	901 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2200 Seattle, WA 98164		Via Messenger Delivery Via Overnight Courier	
8	Phone: Fax:	206-669-3899		Via FedEx	
9	Email:	dangrausz@gmail.com			
10	Name: Law Firm:	Stephen M. Rummage Davis Wright Tremaine LLP		Via electronic mail per agreement Via U.S. Mail	
11	Address:	920 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3300		Via Messenger Delivery	
12	Address: Phone:	Seattle, WA 98104-1610 206-757-8136		Via Overnight Courier Via Facsimile	
13	Fax:	206-757-7136		Via FedEx	
14	Email:	steverummage@dwt.com			
15	DATED this 6th day of December, 2018.				
16					
17		<u>.</u>	/ Chi	ristine F. Zea	
18	Christine F. Zea Legal Administrative Assistant				
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					

Fox Rothschild LLP