

**REPORT and DECISION of the SNOHOMISH
COUNTY HEARING EXAMINER PRO TEM**

DATE OF DECISION: July 30, 2008

PLAT/PROJECT NAME: ***SNOHOMISH COUNTY PUD NO. 1
KAYAK WATER TREATMENT FACILITIES***

APPLICANT/
LANDOWNER: Snohomish County PUD No. 1

FILE NO.: 07-108095 LU

TYPE OF REQUESTS: Conditional Use Permit (CUP) and Landscape Modification

DECISION (SUMMARY):

The request for a CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT is **APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS**.
The request for a LANDSCAPE MODIFICATION is **APPROVED**.

BASIC INFORMATION

LOCATION: The subject property is located at 16315 66th Avenue NW, Stanwood, WA

ZONING: Rural-5 Acre (R-5)

GPP Designation: Rural Residential

UTILITIES: Water/Sewer: Snohomish County PUD No. 1

SCHOOL DISTRICT: Stanwood-Camano School District No. 401

FIRE DISTRICT: No. 14

SELECTED AGENCY RECOMMENDATIONS:

Department of:

Planning and Development Services: Approve, subject to a precondition and conditions

INTRODUCTION

The Applicant filed the Master Application on August 15, 2007. (Exhibit 1)

The Department of Planning and Development Services (PDS) gave proper public notice of the open record hearing as required by the County Code. (Exhibits 6A-6C)

A SEPA determination was made on February 15, 2008. (Exhibit 5A1) No appeal was filed.

The Examiner held an open record hearing on June 10, 2008, the 94th day of the 120-day decision making period. Witnesses were sworn, testimony was presented, and exhibits were entered at the hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING

The public hearing commenced on June 10, 2008 at 1:00 p.m.

1. The Examiner indicated that she has read the PDS staff report, reviewed the file and viewed the area and therefore has a general idea of the particular request involved.
2. The parties and witnesses were sworn in en masse.
3. Elbert Esparza appeared for PDS. Grant Wood and Karen Heneghan appeared on behalf of the Applicant, Snohomish PUD NO. 1, along with their attorney, Chris Knapp, of the Anderson Hunter law firm.
4. No one appeared in opposition to the request, although a letter was submitted about the project from Mr. and Mrs. Bowling, the underlying property owners of the subject property which is encumbered by the PUD's utility easement. (Exhibit 9A)

NOTE: For a complete record, an electronic recording of this hearing is available in the Office of the Hearing Examiner.

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND DECISION

FINDINGS OF FACT

Based on all of the evidence in the record, the following findings of fact are entered:

1. The master list of Exhibits and Witnesses which is a part of this file and testimony of witnesses received at the public hearing, which were all considered by the Examiner, is hereby made a part of this file, as if set forth in full herein.
2. The PDS staff report has correctly analyzed the nature of the application, the issues of concern, the application's consistency with adopted codes and policies and land use regulations, and the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). That report is hereby adopted by the Examiner as if set forth in full herein.
3. No one appeared at the public hearing in opposition to the request.

4. Snohomish County PUD No. 1, Water Resources, has applied for a CUP to replace an existing well house with a larger building, a backwash basin, and a new water treatment equipment building with a modification to the required perimeter landscaping (along the east, west, south, and north property lines). All structures, construction, facilities, grading, and drainage work will occur within the boundaries of the existing easement. This request is a companion to work the PUD is completing on a new water tank for which a CUP has been approved (See, File No. 07-108094).
5. The CUP and Landscape Modification application was originally submitted to PDS on August 15, 2007, and was determined on September 12, 2007 to be complete as of the date of submittal for regulatory purposes. The 120-day clock started on September 12, 2007. As of the hearing date, 94 days of the 120-day review period had elapsed.
6. The project is on an easement established with the creation of the subdivisions served by the Kayak Water System (Exhibits 1B & 1C). The easement provided several locations for water facilities throughout the development. This particular site is known as Well Site No. 2. The easement was transferred to Snohomish County PUD No. 1 in October 2006, when the District became the owner of this water system. The Quitclaim Deed for this transaction is set forth in Exhibits 1B & 1C. A search of county records has determined a CUP was not obtained for the well facility with the creation of the subdivisions in the 1980s.
7. All structures, construction, facilities, grading, and drainage work will occur within the boundaries of the existing easement.
8. The surrounding area is zoned Rural 5-acres or "R-5." The site is sloped with two Type 4 streams and a portion of a large Category 1, Open Water / Scrub Shrub / Forested Wetland located within 50 feet of both the existing and proposed building locations. The slope runs from east to west towards Lake Rowland. The entire site is heavily vegetated and forested, with the easement area on the eastern edge of the property fronting on to 66th Avenue NW.
9. The request will not generate impacts to the County's park system or the school system.
10. Cultural Resources. The Stillaguamish Tribe was concerned with proximity of a known archeological site and possibility of the discovery of human remains or artifacts. Snohomish PUD No. 1 has entered into a private agreement to provide the construction schedule and allow Tribal observers on site to monitor for any finds, Exhibits 8C1 (describing concerns), 8C2 (proposing a private agreement), and 8E (describing agreement between PUD No. 1 and Tribe). PDS is recommending against inclusion of these agreements in the conditions of approval.
11. Fire Code. This application is vested to the version of Chapter 30.53A SCC in effect prior to September 21, 2007. The Snohomish County Fire Marshal's office has reviewed the project for compliance with SCC 30.53A and has no objection to the approval of this project. Additional reviews will be conducted during construction permit approval for the water tank permit.
12. Drainage and Grading (Chapters 30.63A and 30.63B SCC). The impervious surface created as a result of the project is below the threshold that requires a full drainage plan. The current drainage system consists of a catch basin, culverts, and a cement lined swale to direct water from the site toward the adjacent stream. The proposed drainage plan will consist of gutters to collect roof runoff and dispersal by splash pads at the base of the downspouts. Rainfall on the surface of the backwash tanks will sheet flow off the top of tanks and disperse on the surrounding ground. All other non-impervious areas will infiltrate into the existing ground. If rainfall exceeds existing capacity of the soil in major rain events, surface drainage will sheet

flow and disperse through the existing dense underbrush surrounding the developed site toward the adjacent stream channels.

13. PDS (Engineering) has reviewed the proposed subdivision and is recommending approval of the project, subject to conditions which would be imposed during full drainage plan review pursuant to Chapter 30.63A SCC. Water quality will be controlled during construction by use of silt fences and straw bales in accordance with a Temporary Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (TESCP) required by Chapter 30.63A SCC.
14. Critical Areas. A PDS Biological Technician conducted a site visit on September 24, 2007. Two Type 4 streams and part of a Category 1 wetland were identified within 50 feet of both the existing and proposed building locations. The critical areas were not flagged in the field for verification at the time of the initial site visit; however the site was re-visited on December 6, 2007 and all critical areas were found to have been properly flagged in the field as required.
15. Snohomish County PUD No. 1 has an existing easement on the property with two existing structures associated with two well sites (Well No. 2 & Well No. 3). The smaller building (10 feet x 12 feet) associated with Well No. 3 is proposed to be removed and replaced with a new 18 feet x 28 feet water treatment building and an additional 12.5 feet x 32 feet backwash basin. Some minor grading will occur within the confines of the established easement area for foundation work and backfill adjacent to the wash basin. No new activities are proposed within the vegetated buffer on the easement except for some minor landscaping with native species. The Applicant is voluntarily proposing to landscape a portion of the buffer that falls within the easement with native species. The proposed landscaped area is not required to be dedicated as NGPA/E because the proposed activity complies with SCC 30.62.075(6) and SCC 30.62.360.
16. The Applicant is proposing to remove a small existing building and construct a larger building along with a wash basin in the same general location. The current building and the footprint of the new facilities lie within an existing utility easement that contains two existing buildings and maintained lawn with landscaping. Both of these actions are proposed pursuant to SCC 30.62.360(1) as BMP actions within existing utility corridors (easement). The Applicant has voluntarily submitted a CASP/mitigation plan to show compliance with SCC 30.62.345 even though no plan was technically required to be submitted. Because these proposed actions are regulated pursuant to SCC 30.62.360, the applicant is not required to record a binding site development plan or CASP per SCC 30.62.075(6).
17. An evaluation of the information submitted in the revised application coupled with an on-site investigation has resulted in a determination that the application is complete and in conformance with Chapter 30.62 UDC (Critical Areas Regulation) and is consistent with the purpose and objectives of the Chapter in regulation of development activities in Critical Areas to safeguard the public health, safety and welfare.
18. GMA Comprehensive Plan (General Policy Plan, "GPP"). This application has been evaluated for consistency with the version of the GMA Comprehensive Plan (GMACP) which became effective on February 1, 2006, through the completeness date of the application. This application is consistent with the GMACP. Under GMA, the County is the coordinator of inter-jurisdictional infrastructure planning coordination for water supply. It has adopted goals and objectives related to the provision of utility service with which this project must be consistent. Those include:

GOAL UT 1 - Enhance the efficiency and quality of service from utility providers through the review of utility, land use, transportation and natural environment planning documents. . . .

Objective UT 1.B Achieve and maintain consistency between utility system expansion plans and planned land use patterns; [and] . . .

GOAL UT 2 – Work with provider agencies of Snohomish County and *assist them in ensuring the availability of a reliable, high quality water supply for all households within the county* in a manner that is consistent with the comprehensive plan and protection of the natural environment.

Approval of the proposed new facilities will be in compliance with Goals UT 1 and 2, and objectives UT 1B of the Utilities Element of the GPP. In addition, the County's GPP requires that the County support rural residential uses. Specific policies related to this issue include:

Rural Element LU Policies:

6.A.1 - Accommodate the portion of the 20-year growth not assigned to the urban growth areas at appropriate rural densities and using rural development standards;

6.A.2 - Establish rural infrastructure standards that are consistent with appropriate rural development patterns and densities.

The proposed development is consistent with these rural land use policies in that the project will provide improved water service and infrastructure improvements consistent with the County's design and construction standards and will accommodate rural residential development in the adjacent area.

19. Zoning (Chapter 30.2 SCC). The project as designed, with the proposed landscaping modification, meets the Zoning Code requirements for lot size, and bulk regulations (e.g., setbacks, height and lot coverage and other zoning code requirements such as parking and landscaping).
20. SEPA (Chapter 30.61 SCC) The Snohomish County Public Utility District No. 1, being the lead agency for SEPA review, issued a Determination of Nonsignificance (DNS) for the subject development on February 15, 2008 (Exhibit 5A1). The DNS was not appealed.
21. Landscaping -- Modification Request – Perimeter Buffer (Chapter 30.25.040) According to SCC 30.25.020(2), a 20-foot-wide Type A landscaping area is required around the perimeter of the project site and 10 feet of Type B landscaping is required along the road frontage of 66th Avenue N.W. The Applicant has applied for a Landscape Modification (Exhibit 1E) to allow the existing trees and vegetation to the immediate west of the project site and the existing vegetation and trees to the north and south of the project site to be considered adequate landscape buffer for these respective perimeters. These areas are part of residential use to the north, and provide visibility screening from adjacent residences or rights-of-way, and will not be developed. The Applicant will provide more than the required 10 feet of Type B Landscaping along the frontage of 66 Avenue N.W., for which no modification is needed.
22. Landscaping – Modification Request – Approval Criteria. Landscaping modification requests are governed by SCC 30.25.040. The landscaping proposed must provide equal or better results than the Code requirements or fulfill the intended purpose of the landscaping required by

the Code. (SCC 30.25.040(2)) In addition, the County favors: (a) the preservation of existing vegetation, particularly stands of mature trees standing 50 feet or more in height, or other groupings of natural vegetation in consolidated locations; (b) better accommodation of existing physical conditions on site, including incorporation of elements to provide for wind protection or improve solar access; (c) incorporation of elements to protect or improve water quality; (d) increased landscaping width adjacent to residential uses or zones or in other strategic locations; and (e) the provision of a unique focal point of interest or better useable open space.

23. PDS has reviewed the Applicant's request and is in agreement that the PUD's proposed landscaping treatment is equal to or better than the required 20-foot Type A landscaping requirement. PDS further agrees that the proposed landscaping treatment fulfills the intended purpose of screening the proposed project site from view by neighboring residential uses and recommended approval of the landscaping modification.
24. Conditional Use Permit (Chapter 30.42 SCC) Snohomish County PUD No. 1, Water Resources, has applied for a CUP to remove and replace an existing well house with a new, larger building for water treatment equipment. Backwash water from treatment will be directed to a concrete tank or series of tanks, with a total volume of approximately 12,000 gallons, for settling and recycle. Settled spoils will be periodically removed and transported to a municipal wastewater plant. There will be no on-site disposal of settled backwash solids. The proposal will also include the construction of a new water treatment equipment building with a modification to the required perimeter landscaping (along the east, west, south, and north property lines). All structures, construction, facilities, grading, and drainage work will occur within the boundaries of the existing easement.
25. The applicant has provided an analysis of how they meet the decision criteria required for a CUP. (See Exhibit No. 1G) The Hearing Examiner may approve, approve with conditions, or deny a conditional use permit only when all the following criteria are met:
 - (a) The proposal is consistent with the comprehensive plan.

Water treatment facilities, buildings, and well houses are allowed in rural areas with a CUP. The facility will provide increased clean water and water pressure both in and outside of Urban Growth Areas (UGA) which are experiencing rapid growth and serves the residents of the area; the proposal is consistent with the adopted GPP.
 - (b) The proposal complies with applicable requirements of this title.

This project meets zoning code requirements for bulk regulations, parking, landscaping (with the approved modification), lot coverage, height and other zoning code requirements.
 - (c) The proposal will not be materially detrimental to uses or property in the immediate vicinity.

Water well houses, water treatment facilities and buildings are essential infrastructure elements with single family development and even though the site is not within the UGA; given the level of development in the vicinity, and the projected future development, the well house and treatment facility will be assets to the area and will not be materially detrimental to uses or property in the immediate vicinity.
 - (d) The proposal is compatible with and incorporates specific features, conditions, or revisions that ensure it responds appropriately to the existing or intended character, appearance, quality of development, and physical characteristics of the site and surrounding property.

After reviewing the proposed development in light of these CUP standards, the Hearing Examiner finds that the standards are met and no adverse affects will be made to the area as a result of allowing the construction of two new water treatment buildings and a backwash tank or tanks.

26. The new well house, water treatment building, and equipment facilities are being proposed on a site that only partially borders public right-of-way. The proposed CUP area will have a larger than 20-foot wide buffer along the north, south and west sides. The applicant has proposed a wider than 10 foot buffer along the 66th Avenue NW right-of-way. The perimeter buffers will incorporate all of the existing trees and vegetation on the north, south and west sides and as much of the existing vegetation and trees as possible along 66th Avenue NW. The combined buffers will adequately insure compatibility between the treatment facility and the surrounding area.
27. Given the existing conditions and the proposed design, there is no evidence in the record that would warrant the imposition of any additional conditions by the Hearing Examiner beyond those being imposed through the Snohomish County Code, the PDS's recommendations or proposals made by the Applicant. The PUD's permit application meets the requirements for the issuance of a CUP under Chapter 30.42C SCC, in particular the decision criteria set forth in SCC 30.42C.100.
28. The Snohomish County Public Utility District, No. 1 is a public agency and, as such, is not required to post bonds.
29. The request is consistent with Section 30.70.100 SCC, which requires, pursuant to RCW 36.70B.040, that all project permit applications be consistent with the GMACP and GMA-based county codes.
30. Any Finding of Fact in this decision which should be deemed a Conclusion is hereby adopted as such.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Examiner having fully reviewed the entire record and testimony provided at the public hearing and being fully informed hereby enters the following conclusions of law:

1. The PUD's request for a CUP to construct two new water treatment buildings and backwash tank(s) is consistent with the GMACP, GMA-based County Codes, and the type and character of land use permitted on the site, the permitted density and the applicable design and development standards. The development application meets the requirements of SCC 30.70.100.
2. The application meets the requirements for the issuance of a CUP pursuant to the decision criteria set forth in SCC 30.42C.100. No adverse affects will be made to the area as a result of allowing the construction of these new water treatment facilities. The Hearing Examiner concludes that no additional conditions should be imposed beyond those requirements set forth in the Snohomish County Code.
3. An applicant may request modification of landscaping requirements as part of project review. The Hearing Examiner may approve a request for modification when (a) the proposed

landscaping represents an equal or better result than would be achieved by strictly following the requirements of the code; or (b) The proposed landscaping fulfills its intended purpose as described in SCC 30.25.040.

4. The Hearing Examiner concludes that the proposed modification to allow the existing natural vegetation to the immediate west, east, north and south of the project site to serve as an adequate landscape buffer for these respective perimeters, meets the requirements of SCC 30.25.040(2) and (5)(a). These areas are fully vegetated with native growth trees and plants, are not visible from adjacent residences or rights-of-way, and will not be developed. The proposed landscaping is equal to or better than the landscaping which is required by the County Code.
5. The recipient of any CUP shall file a land use permit binder on a form provided by PDS with the County Auditor prior to any of the following: initiation of any further site work, issuance of any development/construction permits by the county, or occupancy/use of the subject property or buildings thereon for the use or activity authorized. The binder shall serve both as acknowledgement of and agreement to abide by the terms and conditions of the CUP and as a notice to prospective purchasers of the existence of the permit. (SCC 30.42C.200)
6. Any Conclusion in this report and decision which should be deemed a Finding of Fact is hereby adopted as such.

DECISION

Based on the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law entered above, the decision of the Hearing Examiner on the application is as follows:

The request for a **LANDSCAPING MODIFICATION** is hereby **APPROVED**.

The request for a **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT** is hereby **CONDITIONALLY APPROVED**, subject to the following **PRECONDITION** and **CONDITIONS**:

PRECONDITION

Provide documentation that shows that Snohomish PUD No. 1 has obtained permission from the property owner for any water treatment or other facilities that are located outside of the utility easement or relocate those facilities within the easement.

CONDITIONS

- A. The official site plan received by PDS on 2/27/08 (Exhibit 2B4) shall be the official site plan. SCC 30.42C.110 governs changes to the official site plan.
- B. A Land Use Permit Binder, (enclosed with the applicant's copy of this decision), shall be recorded prior to construction permitting.
- C. The applicant shall comply with best management practices as required per SCC 30.62.360(1) through the implementation of the mitigation plan consistent with the voluntary Critical Area Study and Habitat Management Plan – Snohomish County PUD No. 1 – Kayak Water Tank revised on February 27, 2008.

Nothing in this permit/approval excuses the applicant, owner, lessee, agent, successor or assigns from compliance with any other federal, state or local statutes, ordinances or regulations applicable to this project.

Decision issued this 30th day of July, 2008.

Millie Judge, Hearing Examiner Pro Tem

EXPLANATION OF RECONSIDERATION AND APPEAL PROCEDURES

The decision of the Hearing Examiner is final and conclusive with right of appeal to the County Council. However, reconsideration by the Examiner may also be sought by one or more parties of record. The following paragraphs summarize the reconsideration and appeal processes. For more information about reconsideration and appeal procedures, please see Chapter 30.72 SCC and the respective Examiner and Council Rules of Procedure.

Reconsideration

Any party of record may request reconsideration by the Examiner within 10 days from the date of this decision. A petition for reconsideration must be filed in writing with the Office of the Hearing Examiner, 2nd Floor, Robert J. Drewel Building, 3000 Rockefeller Avenue, Everett, Washington, (Mailing Address: M/S No. 405, 3000 Rockefeller Avenue, Everett WA 98201) on or before **August 11, 2008**. There is no fee for filing a petition for reconsideration. **“The petitioner for reconsideration shall mail or otherwise provide a copy of the petition for reconsideration to all parties of record on the date of filing.” [SCC 30.72.065]**

A petition for reconsideration does not have to be in a special form but must: contain the name, mailing address and daytime telephone number of the petitioner, together with the signature of the petitioner or of the petitioner's attorney, if any; identify the specific findings, conclusions, actions and/or conditions for which reconsideration is requested; state the relief requested; and, where applicable, identify the specific nature of any newly discovered evidence and/or changes proposed by the applicant.

The grounds for seeking reconsideration are limited to the following:

- (a) The Hearing Examiner exceeded the Hearing Examiner's jurisdiction;

- (b) The Hearing Examiner failed to follow the applicable procedure in reaching the Hearing Examiner's decision;
- (c) The Hearing Examiner committed an error of law;
- (d) The Hearing Examiner's findings, conclusions and/or conditions are not supported by the record;
- (e) New evidence which could not reasonably have been produced and which is material to the decision is discovered; or
- (f) The applicant proposed changes to the application in response to deficiencies identified in the decision.

Petitions for reconsideration will be processed and considered by the Hearing Examiner pursuant to the provisions of SCC 30.72.065. Please include the County file number in any correspondence regarding this case.

Appeal

An appeal to the County Council may be filed by any aggrieved party of record within 14 days from the date of this decision. Where the reconsideration process of SCC 30.72.065 has been invoked, no appeal may be filed until the reconsideration petition has been disposed of by the hearing examiner. An aggrieved party need not file a petition for reconsideration but may file an appeal directly to the County Council. If a petition for reconsideration is filed, issues subsequently raised by that party on appeal to the County Council shall be limited to those issues raised in the petition for reconsideration.

Appeals shall be addressed to the Snohomish County Council but shall be filed in writing with the Department of Planning and Development Services, 2nd Floor, County Administration-East Building, 3000 Rockefeller Avenue, Everett, Washington (Mailing address: M/S No. 604, 3000 Rockefeller Avenue, Everett, WA 98201) on or before **August 13, 2008**, and shall be accompanied by a filing fee in the amount of five hundred dollars (\$500.00); PROVIDED, that the filing fee shall not be charged to a department of the County or to other than the first appellant; and PROVIDED FURTHER, that the filing fee shall be refunded in any case where an appeal is dismissed without hearing because of untimely filing, lack of standing, lack of jurisdiction or other procedural defect. [SCC 30.72.070]

An appeal must contain the following items in order to be complete: a detailed statement of the grounds for appeal; a detailed statement of the facts upon which the appeal is based, including citations to specific Hearing Examiner findings, conclusions, exhibits or oral testimony; written arguments in support of the appeal; the name, mailing address and daytime telephone number of each appellant, together with the signature of at least one of the appellants or of the attorney for the appellant(s), if any; the name, mailing address, daytime telephone number and signature of the appellant's agent or representative, if any; and the required filing fee.

The grounds for filing an appeal shall be limited to the following:

- (a) The decision exceeded the Hearing Examiner's jurisdiction;
- (b) The Hearing Examiner failed to follow the applicable procedure in reaching his decision;
- (c) The Hearing Examiner committed an error of law; or

- (d) The Hearing Examiner's findings, conclusions and/or conditions are not supported by substantial evidence in the record. [SCC 30.72.080]

Appeals will be processed and considered by the County Council pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 30.72 SCC. Please include the County file number in any correspondence regarding the case.

This decision is binding but will not become effective until the above precondition(s) have been fulfilled and acknowledged by the Department of Planning and Development Services (PDS) on the original of the instant decision. Document(s) required for fulfillment of the precondition(s) must be filed in a complete, executed fashion with PDS not later than July 29, 2009.

1. "Fulfillment" as used herein means recordation with the County Auditor, approval/acceptance by the County Council and/or Hearing Examiner, and/or such other final action as is appropriate to the particular precondition(s).
2. One and only one six month period will be allowed for resubmittal of any required document(s) which is (are) returned to the applicant for correction.
3. This conditional approval will automatically be null and void if all required precondition(s) have not been fulfilled as set forth above; PROVIDED, that:
 - A. The Examiner may grant a one-time extension of the submittal deadline for not more than twelve (12) months for just cause shown if and only if a written request for such extension is received by the Examiner prior to the expiration of the original time period; and
 - B. The submittal deadline will be extended automatically an amount equal to the number of days involved in any appeal proceedings.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF FULFILLMENT OF PRECONDITIONS

The above imposed precondition(s) having been fulfilled by the applicant and/or the successors in interest, the Department of Planning and Development Services hereby states that the instant decision is effective as of _____, _____.

Certified by:

(Name)

(Title)

The Land Use Permit Binder, which must be executed and recorded as required by SCC 30.42C.200, will be provided by the department. The Binder should **not** be recorded until all reconsideration and/or appeal proceedings have been concluded and the permit has become effective.

Staff Distribution:

Department of Planning and Development Services: Elbert Esparza

The following statement is provided pursuant to RCW 36.70B.130: "Affected property owners may request a change in valuation for property tax purposes notwithstanding any program of revaluation." A copy of this Decision is being provided to the Snohomish County Assessor as required by RCW 36.70B.130.