

**FINDINGS AND DECISION
OF THE HEARING EXAMINER FOR THE CITY OF SEATTLE**

In the Matter of the Appeal of

Hearing Examiner File:
W-25-008

**LAKE WASHINGTON WORKING
FAMILIES**

from a Determination of Non-Significance
issued by the Director, Seattle Department of
Construction and Inspections

Introduction

The Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (“Department”) issued a Determination of Non-Significance (“DNS” or “Decision”) in association with a Land Use Application to allow the replacement of a portion of an existing building with new exterior walls, sidewalks, paving, and landscape, and reconfiguration of parking lot (“Proposal” or “Project”). The Appellant, Lake Washington Working Families (“Appellant”), exercised the right to appeal pursuant to Chapter 25.05 Seattle Municipal Code.

The appeal hearing was held on February 3, 2026, before the undersigned Hearing Examiner. Parties represented at the proceeding were: the Appellant, represented by Karl G. Anuta, the applicant Nick Wheeler, JSA Civil, LLC and project proponent WinCo Foods (collectively herein “Applicant”), and the Department, by Senior Land Use Planner Carly Guillory. The parties submitted final closing briefing on February 18, 2026. The Hearing Examiner conducted a site visit on March 4, 2026 and the record was closed on that date.

For purposes of this decision, all section numbers refer to the Seattle Municipal Code (“SMC” or “Code”) unless otherwise indicated. After considering the evidence in the record and reviewing the site, the Examiner enters the following findings of fact, conclusions and decision on the appeal.

Findings of Fact

1. The Department issued the DNS on October 20, 2025.
2. The DNS provides the following summary of the proposal:

Land Use Application to allow the replacement of a portion of an existing building with new exterior walls, sidewalks, paving, and landscape, and reconfiguration of parking lot (WinCo Foods). Project to include 550 cubic yards of grading and update of existing underground stormwater facilities. Additional parking for 11 vehicles proposed (558 total).

Exhibit 7.

3. The DNS describes the existing site as:

The site is generally rectangular in shape with street frontage along portions of the north, south, and west property lines. The existing structure is approximately 145,000 square feet in size, is currently vacant, and sits approximately in the northeast corner of the site and is surrounded by surface parking lot and load/unload area. Surrounding development includes commercial uses to the north, south, and west, and single- and multi-family residential units to the north and east.

Exhibit 7.

4. The DNS determined that the Proposal would not have probable significant adverse impacts on the environment.
5. The project proposes to remodel a former Sam's Club store into a WinCo store ("Project"). The former Sam's Club and the new proposed WinCo store are both classified as the same use under the Code - Multipurpose Retail Sales - permitted uses within the Commercial 1 ("C-1") zoning designation. No change of use is proposed.
6. The former Sam's Club store closed in 2018, and the record indicates that the structure, and significant portions of the adjacent site have remained vacant and unused since that time.
7. The Project proposes demolition of a portion of the existing structure, exterior changes to the existing building. The footprint of the building will be reduced by approximately 17,000 square feet and a new exterior wall will be created on the south side of the building along with a new entrance. The majority of the building exterior, and the 511,981 square foot site will not be significantly altered.
8. Concerning transportation and traffic impacts, in issuing the DNS, the Director relied on SMC Title 11 (Vehicles and Traffic) and SMC Title 15 (Street and Sidewalk Use) to address both construction and operational impacts, as authorized by SMC 25.05.665 and SMC 25.05.675.B (Construction Impacts Policy).
9. The DNS acknowledged that Project related construction and operational activities will generate greenhouse gas emissions but concluded that no additional mitigation was warranted.
10. The Appellant filed an appeal of the Director's decision on November 3, 2025.

11. The appeal is of a decision by the Department to approve Application 3042320-LU (a Master Use Permit) at 13550 Aurora Avenue North. That application seeks to renovate the existing vacant building and parking lot into a WinCo grocery store. The appeal challenges the adequacy of the Department's SEPA process and decision to issue a DNS.
12. In its Notice of Appeal, the Appellant raised concerns with the adequacy of the DNS, and specifically raised concerns regarding water quality, traffic impacts, air quality, and a collection of "neighborhood impacts" including but not limited to noise, aesthetics, lighting, and odors.
13. At the hearing the Appellant presented testimony by Benjamin Brostrom. Mr. Brostrom identified himself as a member of Lake Washington Working Families and testified concerning growing up and visiting family in that area and observing and driving through traffic in areas near the Project. He also expressed his concerns about various potential environmental impacts of the Project.
14. Testifying at hearing for the Appellant was Professor Ananad Jayakaran. Professor Jayakaran is a professor at Washington State University and testified as a stormwater expert. Professor Jayakaran testified concerning potential adverse impacts of stormwater pollutants including 6PPDQ¹ and the stormwater treatment system proposed by Applicant. Professor Jayakaran indicated that the treatment system selected by Applicant is less effective than the available alternatives of bioretention and permeable pavement. Professor Jayakaran prepared a report (Exhibit 15) which generally discussed the source of 6PPDQ and environmental concerns associated with the substances including potential impacts to salmonids. This report indicated in part that 6PPDQ could be distributed on the site in an amount of 1.4 grams to 500 grams or more per day for a passenger car, and 30 grams to 10,000 grams or more per day for a larger truck. These calculations indicate that 6 tons (or more) of 6PPDQ could be dropped on a single parking lot every day. These figures were developed from a study concerning multi-lane road runoff in Seattle, Los Angeles, and San Francisco, and not from parking lots. In addition, Professor Jayakaran acknowledged that his estimate leads to the potential for extremely high figures. Lastly, there was no analysis performed of the actual distribution of 6PPDQ that would occur with regard to the Project or what the

¹ "6PPD-quinone (6PPDQ) is formed from N-(1,3-dimethylbutyl)-N'-phenyl-p-phenylenediamine (Tian et al., 2021), a rubber additive used in vehicle tires to protect them from cracking, as it reacts with ozone and other oxidants in the air. 6PPD comprises about 0.4-2% of a tire's mass (Babbit, 2010). As tires abrade on pavement, they shed tire-wear particles and associated chemicals; 6PPD on or near those particles can be transformed by atmospheric oxidants (especially ozone) into 6PPDQ (Tian et al., 2021). The result is a very "road-linked" contaminant: it builds up on streets and other hard surfaces, then gets mobilized during rain as roadway runoff, with additional contributions possible from dry deposition and winter snowmelt pulses (Seiwart et al., 2022). Multiple field and lab studies have tied environmental detections of 6PPDQ to this tire-wear → oxidation → runoff pathway, while also noting that wastewater pathways are typically minor compared with stormwater in many settings." Exhibit 15 at 2.

project specific impacts would be to local waterways or other aspects of the environment. The conclusion in the report indicated:

While it is unknown without data collection the impact of 6PPDQ emanating from the WinCo parking lot to Green Lake's fish, based on available evidence of how 6PPDQ impacts species listed in Table 1, and the high loading rates of 6PPDQ on the stormwater system, it is very likely there is some ecosystem impact within Green Lake.

Exhibit 15 at 7.

Thus, the report found a likelihood of an impact but did not quantify that impact to know if it would result in a more than moderate negative impact on the environment.

Professor Jayakaran also testified concerning the stormwater treatment system proposed by the Applicant, and proposed alternatives for mitigation of stormwater impacts including bioretention and permeable pavement.

15. Rick Nys is a licensed traffic engineer and testified for the Appellant concerning potential traffic impacts of the Project. Mr. Nys testified that traffic in the vicinity of the present condition of the Project location accounts for average daily traffic of approximately 29,000 trips per day. His analysis (based in part on information provided in the SEPA checklist) indicated that there will be approximately 40,000 vehicle trips per day with the Project.
16. Senior Land Use Planner Carly Guillory testified for the Department. Ms. Guillory directly participated in the threshold determination process for the DNS. She testified concerning the Department's SEPA review process, and about various aspects of the Project. She stated that in assessing the Proposal for the threshold determination, baseline conditions were considered as for the previous threshold determination for the historic Sam's store, and for allowed uses of the site, and not for existing conditions as they were at the time of the threshold determination at issue in this case (e.g. a site with a vacant structure and abandoned for years). Ms. Guillory testified that as part of its threshold determination analysis, the Department relied on existing Code to mitigate potential negative impacts of the Project. For example, concerning potential stormwater impacts, the City of Seattle Stormwater Manual is incorporated in Code by reference and Director's Rule 10-2021.
17. Viktor Paykov is a Senior Civil Engineer with the Department. Mr. Paykov testified about Department evaluation of the Proposal's stormwater impacts including stormwater studies prepared for the project. Mr. Paykov testified that he does not evaluate projects for stormwater treatment capacity to manage 6PPDQ.

18. Carson Cheung is a Civil Engineer with the City and was called by the Applicant to testify concerning Project review.
19. Greg Goins is the Vice President of real estate for WinCo, and he testified about general aspects of the Project for the Applicant.
20. Ronald Schrieber is the Project Manager for the Applicant, and testified concerning Project design, process, and application.
21. Chad Pollock is the Project architect and testified about the architecture and design of the Project.
22. The Applicant's stormwater expert, Brandon Johnson also testified. Mr. Johnson testified that the Project site contains an underground stormwater treatment apparatus, including existing vaults. He indicated that the Project plans to provide a similar type of treatment and conveyance and will add an additional vault and a Filterra enhanced treatment system. He indicated that stormwater from the new or modified pollution generating surfaces in the Project will also be filtered through the enhanced treatment Filterra system. Mr. Johnson indicated that pavement and bioretention are not viable alternatives for stormwater treatment at the site, because the soils at the Project site are not suitable for infiltration due to the large amount of compacted fill material from preexisting improvements.
23. SMC 25.05.752 defines "Impacts" as "the effects or consequences of actions. Environmental impacts are effects upon the elements of the environment listed in Section 25.05.444."
24. "A proposal's effects include direct and indirect impacts caused by a proposal. Impacts include those effects resulting from growth *caused by a proposal* . . ." SMC 25.05.060 D. (Emphasis added.)
25. "Probable" is defined in SMC 25.05.782 as "likely or reasonably likely to occur . . ."
26. SMC 25.05.794 defines "significant" as "a reasonable likelihood of more than a moderate adverse impact on environmental quality. . . Significance involves context and intensity . . . The context may vary with the physical setting. Intensity depends on the magnitude and duration of an impact . . . Section 25.05.330 specifies a process, including criteria and procedures, for determining whether a proposal is likely to have a significant adverse environmental impact."
27. SMC 25.05.330 directs that, in making the threshold determination, the responsible official shall determine "if the proposal is likely to have a probable significant adverse environmental impact . . ." If the responsible official "reasonably believes that a proposal may have" such an impact, an environmental impact statement is required. SMC 25.05.360.

28. The City's SEPA Overview Policy states, in part, that:

[m]any environmental concerns have been incorporated in the City's codes and development regulations. Where City regulations have been adopted to address an environmental impact, it shall be presumed that such regulations are adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation subject to the limitations set forth in subparagraphs D1 through D7 below.

29. SMC 25.05.665 D. Subparagraphs D.1 through D.7 cover situations where existing regulations may be inadequate or unavailable to assure mitigation of adverse impacts and thus, SEPA-based mitigation is appropriate.

Conclusions

1. The Hearing Examiner has jurisdiction over this appeal pursuant to SMC 25.05.680.B, which also requires that the Hearing Examiner give substantial weight to the Director's determination.

2. As a preliminary matter the Applicant argued that the Appellant does not have standing. The Applicant's argument is largely based on standards of judicial standing² and does not properly consider SMC standing requirements for a SEPA appeal. In this forum, the standards provided in the Code prevail. Under the SMC, appeals may be initiated by "any person significantly affected by or interested in the permit." SMC 23.76.022(C)(2). An "Interested Person" is defined as "any individual, partnership, corporation, association, or public or private organization of any character significantly affected by or interested in proceedings before an agency..." SMC 3.02.020. This is a very broad standard and is the only one the Examiner is charged with applying in the context of a SEPA appeal under the Code. The Appellant is an "organization of any character" that is "interested" in the proceedings and therefore has standing under the Code for a SEPA appeal. If the City Council had intended for the standards of judicial standing to be applied by the Examiner to SEPA appeals, it would have stated so in the Code. Instead, the City Council adopted specific language in SMC 23.76.022 as a threshold for interested persons to appeal certain SEPA determinations including the DNS at issue. To read the Code as requiring application of the standards of judicial standing would render portions of SMC 23.76.022(C)(2) meaningless as a merely "interested" would no longer be able to appeal a DNS, because they would have to demonstrate injury-in-fact and other elements of judicial standing. It is the

² The Applicant in its closing argument identified the standard for judicial standing as "Washington courts interpret the injury-in-fact prong of organization standing consistent with federal case law. The U.S. Supreme Court in *Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife* held that, "When . . . a plaintiff's asserted injury arises from the government's allegedly unlawful regulation (or lack of regulation) of someone else, much more is needed . . . when the plaintiff is not himself the object of the government action or inaction he challenges, standing is not precluded, but it is ordinarily 'substantially more difficult' to establish." Applicant Closing Brief at 14 (citations omitted).

Examiner's responsibility when interpreting Code to give full effect to the Code as stated on its face.

The Applicant also seemed to argue that an appellant organization must have some legal formation in order to proceed with an appeal. As stated in the Applicant's briefing "citizen groups often file administrative and superior court appeals," and they do so frequently in the forum of the Office of the Hearing Examiner. However, Applicant's assertion that "they most often do so as either a public or private organization lawfully established as a non-profit corporation," is simply not accurate and is not established as a requirement in the Code. Unincorporated citizen groups frequently file appeals with the Office of Hearing Examiner, and they are not turned away for failure to incorporate or otherwise form a legal entity.

3. The party appealing the Director's determination has the burden of proving that it is "clearly erroneous." *Brown v. Tacoma*, 30 Wn. App. 762, 637 P.2d 1005 (1981). Under this standard of review, the decision of the Department may be reversed only if the Hearing Examiner is left with the definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been committed. *Cougar Mt. Assoc. v. King County*, 111 Wn. 2d 742, 747, 765 P.2d 264 (1988).
4. SEPA requires "actual consideration of environmental factors before a DNS can be issued." *Norway Hill Preservation and Protection Ass'n. v. King County*, 87 Wn.2d 267, 275, 552 P.2d 674 (1976). The record must "demonstrate that environmental factors were considered in a manner sufficient to amount to prima facie compliance with the procedural requirements of SEPA." *Id.* at 276 (citation omitted).
5. Neither the SEPA statute nor the City's SEPA Code identify a specific baseline for environmental analysis. However, environmental impact analysis in relation to existing conditions is the norm established by case law. *See, e.g., East County Reclamation Co. v. Bjornsen*, 125 Wn. App. 432, 435, 105 P.3d 94 (2005); *Floating Homes Assoc. v. Washington Dept. of Fish and Wildlife*, 115 Wn. App. 780, 785, 64 P.3d 29 (2003); *Thornton Creek Legal Defense Fund v. City of Seattle*, 113 Wn. App. 34, 59, 52 P.3d 522 (2002); *Richland Homeowners Preservation Ass'n. v. Young*, 18 Wn. App. 405, 411, 568 P.2d 818 (1977). "We have also established that the appropriate baseline to compare the environmental impacts of the proposed action is the *condition* of the existing environment, rather than considering the current *uses* of the land." (emphasis in original) *King County v. Friends of Sammamish Valley*, 3 Wash.3d 793, 822, 556 P.3d 132 (2024) (citing *Wild Fish Conservancy v. Dept. of Fish and Wildlife*, 198 Wash.2d 846, 502 P.3d 359 (2022)). In *King County v. Friends of Sammamish Valley*, the Washington Supreme Court overruled a decision by the Court of Appeals that had looked at allowed uses of the land at issue under an ordinance and upheld a decision by the Growth Management Hearings Board that called for examination of the existing condition of the land at issue. Similarly, in *Wild Fish Conservancy* the court rejected the suggestion that baseline conditions should be established by examining solely what would be legally allowed in the subject area under a future permit, and instead indicated the

baseline conditions needed to be established by looking at actual existing conditions stating “[r]ather than establishing the baseline on the current *uses* of the land . . . , the appropriate baseline to compare the proposal's environmental impacts is the *condition* of the existing environment.” 198 Wash.2d at 872. In these cases, the term “use” was utilized to reference legal or permitted uses, and “condition” was used to describe the physical environment. At hearing some evidence indicated that the Department may have an established practice of considering a site’s allowed use to determine baseline conditions and not existing conditions for purposes of a threshold determination. If this is the case, the Department’s practice is inconsistent with established SEPA caselaw and is therefore not accorded deference.

The Project site has been in its current vacant condition since 2018. The Department and Applicant witnesses testified that neither the Department nor Applicant analyzed what current traffic, stormwater, noise or other environmental conditions (e.g. a partly vacant abandoned site) are in the area of the Proposal as part of the threshold determination. Therefore, the Department did not properly determine baseline conditions of the Proposal as part its threshold determination. In contrast to established SEPA caselaw the Department considered permitted uses of the Project area as the baseline and not the existing conditions. While case law does not establish what “current” conditions are, the passage of seven years or more and the land remaining vacant of uses cannot be considered comparable with the permitted use of a big-box store which discontinued functioning on the site years ago. Without establishing a proper baseline, the Department cannot be considered to have had adequate information in order to determine that the Proposal would have no likelihood of a significant negative environmental impact. See e.g. *Wild Fish Conservancy v. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife*, 198 Wash.2d 846, 873, 502 P.3d 359 (2022) (“We also consider whether the decision to issue an MDNS was ‘based on information sufficient to evaluate the proposal's environmental impact.’”) SMC 25.05.030.B. requires “Agencies shall to the fullest extent possible . . . [p]repare environmental documents that . . . are supported by evidence that the necessary environmental analyses have been made.” In the absence of a proper baseline, the record does not demonstrate that environmental factors were considered in a manner sufficient to amount to *prima facie* compliance with the procedural requirements of SEPA. See e.g. *King County v. Friends of Sammamish Valley*, 3 Wash.3d 793, 816 - 826, 556 P.3d 132 (2024). The decision of the Department to rely primarily on allowed uses as a baseline comparison for the threshold determination analysis, and to not analyze existing conditions to determine baseline conditions is clearly erroneous, and the Hearing Examiner is left with the definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been committed.

6. Where the Appellant argues that the proposal will have significant impacts that the Department did not adequately analyze, to meet its burden of proof under SEPA, the Appellant must present actual evidence of probable significant adverse impacts from the Proposal. *Boehm v. City of Vancouver*, 111 Wn. App. 711, 719, 47 P.3d

137 (2002); *Moss v. City of Bellingham*, 109 Wn. App. 6, 23, 31 P.3d 703 (2001). As noted above, “significance” is defined as “a reasonable likelihood of more than a moderate adverse impact on environmental quality.” WAC 197-11-794. This burden is not met when an appellant only argues that they have a concern about a potential impact or expresses an opinion that more study or review could be done or is necessary.

7. The SEPA Overview Policy (SMC 25.05.665.D) states in part, "where City regulations have been adopted to address an environmental impact, it shall be presumed that such regulations are adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation," subject to some limitations. See also WAC 197-11-158 and WAC 197-11-660. SMC 25.05.665.D further provides:

Unless otherwise specified in Section 25.05.675, denial or mitigation of a project based on adverse environmental impacts shall be permitted only under the following circumstances:

1. No City code or regulation has been adopted for the purpose of mitigating the environmental impact in question; or
 2. The applicable City code or regulation has been judicially invalidated; or
 3. The project site presents unusual circumstances such as substantially different site size or shape, topography, or inadequate infrastructure that would result in adverse environmental impacts which substantially exceed those anticipated by the applicable City code or zoning; or
 4. The development proposal presents unusual features, such as unforeseen design, new technology, or a use not identified in the applicable City code, that would result in adverse environmental impacts which substantially exceed those anticipated by the applicable City code or zoning; or
 5. The project is located near the edge of a zone, and results in substantial problems of transition in scale or use which were not specifically addressed by the applicable City code or zoning; or
 6. The project is vested to a regulation which no longer reflects the City's policy with respect to the relevant environmental impact because of the adoption of more recent policies, provided that the new policies are in effect prior to the issuance of a DNS or DEIS for the project; or
 7. The project creates undue impacts based on cumulative effects as provided for in Section 25.05.670.
8. Concerning transportation and traffic impacts, the Appellant failed to demonstrate that the regulations relied upon by the Director to address transportation and traffic impacts caused by both construction and operational impacts are inadequate. The Appellant did not provide analysis indicating that the regulations are inadequate.

- Appellant's traffic engineer Mr. Nys testified concerning the Project's potential negative impacts on local traffic, including indicating that the Project will result in a nearly 40% increase in total trips along an already highly congested route. However, Mr. Nys' analysis did not extend to providing any quantifiable evidence of any negative impacts this volume of traffic increase would create. Thus, the Appellant failed to demonstrate that the Project is likely to result in significant negative environmental impacts from Project generated transportation and traffic.
9. The Appellant presented no evidence demonstrating that Project related emissions would exceed regulatory thresholds considered by the Department as part of the threshold determination, or that reliance on existing air quality regulation - such as Puget Sound Clean Air Agency requirements - are inadequate to mitigate potential significant negative environmental impacts. Appellant failed to quantify or demonstrate the likelihood of a more than moderate negative environmental impact from emissions. Appellant did not demonstrate that the Project is likely to result in significant negative environmental impacts from Project generated emissions.
 10. Appellant failed to quantify or demonstrate the likelihood of a more than moderate negative environmental impact from noise. The Appellant presented no evidence to indicate the probability of a significant negative environmental impact related to noise and thus did not establish that the Department failed to adequately consider probable, significant noise impacts under SEPA's review requirements.
 11. The Appellant did demonstrate that the Department failed to examine the impacts of the Project to water quality including potential pollution from 6PPDQ. However, the Appellant did not demonstrate with reliable quantifiable evidence that the Project is likely to result in significant negative environmental impacts to water quality. Professor Jayakaran's analysis did identify a potential impact, but it is not possible to discern from the record how such an enormous amount of 6PPDQ – up to 6 tons in a single day - would be found in real world circumstances, and as such Professor Jayakaran's analysis is not reliable for purposes of determining whether the Proposal is likely to have significant negative impacts on the environment in the context of stormwater. Raising a concern that the Department failed to examine a potential environmental impact does not meet Appellant's burden of proof of demonstrating the *likelihood* of a significant environmental impact that was not examined by the Department. The impacts from 6PPDQ identified by the Appellant remain speculative in the context of the evidence provided at hearing. Further, Appellant did not quantify potential stormwater impacts such that it is possible to determine such impacts could be more than moderate and therefore did not demonstrate the presence of any significant impact that the Department should have considered as part of the threshold determination.
 12. There is no evidence in the record that the Proposal would have a significant adverse environmental impact (for any of the potential impacts listed above, and/or for potential impacts such as aesthetics, lighting, and odors that Appellant raised in its Notice of Appeal but did not address at hearing or in closing argument). It is

- not sufficient for Appellant to simply allege inadequacies with the DNS environmental review. Instead, to prevail on the appeal of a DNS, Appellant must demonstrate that there are probable significant negative impacts associated with the proposal. In the absence of evidence showing any probable significant impacts associated with the Proposal the Appellant has failed to meet its burden of proof and no Environmental Impact Statement is required for the Project.
13. The Appellant raised an issue concerning a discrepancy between the Applicant's geotechnical report and preliminary stormwater report, and the DNS concerning a geotechnical environmental critical area. The record demonstrates that the Department reviewed the Applicant's geotechnical report which described the environmental critical area, and therefore considered the environmental critical area for purposes of the threshold determination. The Appellant did not identify any significant environmental impacts associated with the environmental critical area that were not considered by the Department.
 14. Even where the Appellant has failed to meet its burden of proof concerning significant impacts, this is a separate issue from whether the Department should have issued a threshold determination with consideration of a baseline of existing conditions. The Department may yet find that Project impacts, when measured against the proper baseline of existing conditions, result in probable significant negative environmental impacts – or it may not – this must be determined by the Department.

Decision

The Director's decision to issue a Determination of Non-Significance is **REVERSED** consistent with this decision.

Entered April 9, 2026.

/s/Ryan Vancil
Ryan Vancil, Hearing Examiner
Office of Hearing Examiner

Concerning Further Review

NOTE: It is the responsibility of the person seeking to appeal a Hearing Examiner decision to consult Code sections and other appropriate sources, to determine applicable rights and responsibilities.

The decision of the Hearing Examiner in this case is the final SEPA decision for the City of Seattle. Judicial review under SEPA shall be of the decision on the underlying governmental action together with its accompanying environmental determination.

Consult applicable local and state law, including SMC Chapter 25.05 and RCW 43.21C.076, for further information about the appeal process.

If a transcript of the hearing is required by superior court, the person seeking review must arrange for and initially bear the cost of preparing a verbatim transcript of the hearing. Instructions for preparation of the transcript are available from the Office of Hearing Examiner, Room 1320, 618 Second Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98104, (206) 684-0521.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that on this date I sent true and correct copies of the attached **Notice of Prehearing Conference** to each person listed below, or on the attached mailing list, in the matter of **Lake Washington Working Families** Hearing Examiner File: **W-25-008**, in the manner indicated.

Party	Method of Service
Appellant's Authorized Representative Karl Anuta Kga@lokga.net	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S. First Class Mail, postage prepaid <input type="checkbox"/> Inter-office Mail <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> E-mail <input type="checkbox"/> Hand Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Legal Messenger
Department, SDCI Carly Guillory Carly.Guillory@seattle.gov	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S. First Class Mail, postage prepaid <input type="checkbox"/> Inter-office Mail <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> E-mail <input type="checkbox"/> Hand Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Legal Messenger
Applicant and Property Owner Legal Counsel, CSD Attorneys at Law P.S. Timothy Schermetzler tschermetzler@csdlaw.com Megan Holmes mholmes@csdlaw.com	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S. First Class Mail, postage prepaid <input type="checkbox"/> Inter-office Mail <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> E-mail <input type="checkbox"/> Hand Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Legal Messenger

Dated: April 9, 2026

/s/ Angela Oberhansly
Angela Oberhansly
Legal Assistant