

CITY OF SPOKANE HEARING EXAMINER

Re: Conditional Use Permit Application by the) FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS,
City of Spokane Engineering Department) AND DECISION
to allow the construction of a Combined)
Sewer Overflow (CSO) prevention tank)
number IO3 at 2400 W. Buckeye Avenue) FILE NO. Z16-279CUP3

SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL AND DECISION

Proposal: The City of Spokane Engineering Department seeks a conditional use permit in order to allow the construction of a Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) prevention tank number IO3 and associated piping, to be installed underground, in a Residential Single Family Zone. The project also includes a shared-use access road/path and a storm water treatment swale.

Decision: Approved, with conditions.

FINDINGS OF FACT
BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Applicant/ City of Spokane Engineering Services
Owner: 808 West Spokane Falls Boulevard
Spokane, WA 99201

Agent: Dan Buller, P.E.
City of Spokane, Engineering Design
808 W. Spokane Falls Blvd.
Spokane, WA 99201

Property Location: The proposed site is located at and around 2400 W. Buckeye Avenue, in the City of Spokane, Washington. The site is located in the Southwest ¼ of Section 12, Township 22 North, Range 42 East, W.M.

Zoning: The property is zoned RSF (Residential Single-family).

Comprehensive Plan Map Designation: The property is designated as R 4-10 (Residential 4-10 units per acre).

Site Description: The site is a vacant, heavily sloped parcel. The site is located near the intersection of T.J. Meenach Drive and Grace Avenue. The CSO prevention tank will be installed in an area that is gently sloping, with a grade of 10% or less. The area in which the swale will be installed has a steeper slope, with grades between 16-30%.

Surrounding Conditions and Uses: Northwest Boulevard forms the northerly border of the site. Along Northwest Boulevard, the properties are zoned General Commercial. Adjacent to the

General Commercial property, there are several parcels that are zoned Residential Multi-Family. The site itself and the properties to the west, south, and southeast are all zoned Residential Single-Family. To the northeast, beyond the Northwest Boulevard corridor, the land is zoned Residential Single-Family. Consistent with the zoning, there are single family residences to the west and southeast, as well as northerly and beyond Northwest Boulevard. There is open space to the south and southwest. There are commercial and multi-family uses along and near Northwest Boulevard.

Project Description: The City of Spokane Engineering Department is proposing to construct an underground Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) storage tank with the approximate dimensions of 100 feet in width by 180 feet in length. The tank volume is approximately 1.8 million gallons. The precise routing of the piping from the proposed tank back to the interceptor has not been finalized. Three alternatives for routing the piping are depicted in the site plans included in the record. The City's Wastewater Management Department is also proposing to construct a storm water treatment swale in the same location adjacent to the CSO facility. An access pathway will be constructed to serve as both maintenance accesses to the tank hatches and as a section of a shared-use path that will run along T.J. Meenach Drive and will connect, in a future project, to Pettet Drive.

PROCEDURAL INFORMATION

Authorizing Ordinances: Spokane Municipal Code ("SMC") 17C.110, Residential Zones; SMC 17C.320.080(F), Conditional Use Criteria, and SMC 17G.060.170, Decision Criteria.

Notice of Community Meeting: Mailed: March 29, 2016
Posted: March 29, 2016

Notice of Application/Public Hearing: Mailed: May 27, 2016
Posted: May 27, 2016

Community Meeting: April 12, 2016

Public Hearing Date: June 30, 2016

Site Visit: June 21, 2016

SEPA: A Determination of Nonsignificance ("DNS") was issued by the City of Spokane Engineering Department on March 24, 2016. The deadline to appeal the DNS expired on April 7, 2016. The DNS was not appealed.

Testimony:

Ali Brast, Assistant Planner
City of Spokane Planning & Development
808 West Spokane Falls Boulevard
Spokane, WA 99201

Dan Buller, P.E.
City of Spokane Wastewater Department
808 W. Spokane Falls Blvd.
Spokane, WA 99201

Exhibits:

1. Planning Services Staff Report
2. Application, including:
 - 2A General application
 - 2B Conditional Use Permit application
 - 2C Project Narrative
 - 2D Notification Map application
 - 2E Site Plan
 - 2E-1 Alternative 1, Force Main to Grace Sewer, Pumps and Force Main
 - 2E-2 Alternative 2, Force Main to Grace Sewer
 - 2E-3 Alternative 3, Gravity Sewer to near Pettet/TJ Meenach
 - 2F Project Trails and Viewpoint
 - 2G Conditional Use Permit, Counter Complete Checklist
3. Spokane Tribe of Indian comments
 - 3A HRA Cultural Resources Assessment Revised 05-2016
4. Spokane Transit comments dated
 - 4A 04-05-16
 - 4B 04-26-16
5. Notice map
6. Parcel Listing
7. Aerial view of property ownership City owned parcels indicated by red X
8. Notice of Community Meeting
9. Notice of Application and Public Hearing
10. Affidavit of mailings
 - 10A Community Meeting dated 03-29-16
 - 10B Application and Public Hearing dated 05-27-16
11. Affidavit of postings:
 - 11A Community Meeting dated 03-29-16
 - 11B Application and Public Hearing dated 05-27-16
12. Affidavit of sign postings:
 - 12A Community Meeting dated 03-29-16
 - 12B Application and Public Hearing dated 05-27-16
13. Affidavit of sign removal dated 04-13-16
14. SEPA Determination of Nonsignificance dated 03-24-16
15. Environmental checklist dated 03-14-16
16. Community Meeting sign in sheet
17. Community Meeting Summary
18. Community Meeting presentation
19. Letter dated 03-22-16 to Dan Buller from Ali Brast
re: community meeting instructions
20. Letter dated 04-19-16 to Interested Parties from Ali Brast
re: requesting comments
21. Letter dated 05-20-16 to Dan Buller from Ali Brast
re: notice of application and notice of hearing instructions
22. Emails dated 06-10 through 06-14-16 to/from Bill Colvin and City Staff
re: comments regarding the project
23. Emails dated 06-16-16 to/from Cindy Kinzer and Ali Brast
re: HOA Cultural Survey report

- A. Material received at hearing:
 - A-1 Hardcopy of Staff's PowerPoint presentation

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

To be approved, the proposed conditional use permit must comply with the criteria set forth in Spokane Municipal Code sections 17G.060.170 and 17C.320.080(F). The Hearing Examiner has reviewed the proposed conditional use permit and the evidence of record with regard to the application and makes the following findings and conclusions:

1. *The proposal is allowed under the provisions of the land use codes. See SMC 17G.060.170(C)(1).*

The project site is zoned Residential Single Family ("RSF"), a residential category. The uses allowed in the residential zones are shown on Table 17C.110-1. See SMC 17C.110.110. The table does not specifically identify a CSO or related infrastructure among the regulated uses. See Table 17C.110-1. However, storm water facilities and conveyance systems are elsewhere identified as Basic Utilities, an institutional category of use. See Exhibit 1, p. 3.

"Basic Utilities" are infrastructure services that need to be located in or near the area where the service is provided. See SMC 17C.190.400(A). Examples include water and sewer pump stations, sewage disposal and conveyance systems, water towers and reservoirs, water quality and flow control facilities, water conveyance systems, and storm water facilities and conveyance systems. See SMC 17C.190.400(C). The proposed project fits the general definition of a Basic Utility, and is explicitly identified in the examples listed in the municipal code.

According to Table 17C.110-1, Basic Utilities are a limited ("L") use, rather than a conditional use ("CU"). However, the use category for "Basic Utilities" is modified by the bracketed number "[3]", suggesting that additional terms apply. The footnotes to Table 17C.110-1 state: "Standards that correspond to the bracketed numbers [] are stated in SMC 17C.110.110." See Table 17C.110-1. The pertinent portion of SMC 17C.110.110 confirms that its provisions apply to all parts of the table that have a note [3], and further states:

New buildings or larger additions require a conditional use permit and are processed as a Type III application. ...

See SMC 17C.110.110(A)(3). As a result, the project requires a conditional use permit.

The land use codes permit Basic Utilities, such as the proposed project, to be constructed in the RSF zone, so long as the project satisfies the criteria for a conditional use and the other development standards in the municipal code. The Hearing Examiner finds that this criterion is satisfied.

2. *The proposal is consistent with the comprehensive plan designation and goals, objectives, and policies for the property. See SMC 17G.060.170(C)(2).*

Goal 1 of the Land Use element of the comprehensive plan memorializes the objective of providing coordinated, efficient, and cost effective public facilities and utility services. See

Comprehensive Plan ("CP"), Goal LU 1, Citywide Land Use. Goal 6 of the Land Use element seeks to ensure the distribution of adequate and well-located public facilities throughout the city. See CP, Goal LU 6, Adequate Public Lands and Facilities. Policy 1.12 of the Land Use element recognizes that adequate public facilities and services systems must exist to accommodate proposed development, and must exist before development is permitted to occur. See CP, Policy LU 1.12, Public Facilities and Services.

Similarly, the Capital Facilities element calls for the city to provide and maintain adequate public facilities and utility services. See CP, Goal CFU 1, Adequate Public Facilities and Services. Policy CFU 1.2 of the Capital Facilities Element further provides as follows:

Require the development of capital improvement projects that either improve the city's operational efficiency or reduce costs by increasing the capacity, use, and/or life expectancy of existing facilities.

See CP, Policy CFU 1.2, Operational Efficiency.

The project satisfies the foregoing goals and policies by ensuring that the utility infrastructure is adequate to serve the public need. The project is part of a substantial, ongoing effort to site CSO tanks in appropriate locations throughout the city. The proposed tank is part of a larger system designed to control the overflow of untreated storm water and sewage into the Spokane River during storm events, consistent with the mandates of the Department of Ecology. *Testimony of D. Buller*. As a result, while the project does have some environmental impact at the development site, from a broader perspective the project serves to protect the environment, in particular the Spokane River. This fulfills the intent of Goal CFU 5 of the Capital Facilities Element, which states as follows:

Minimize impacts to the environment, public health, and safety through the timely and careful siting and use of capital facilities and utilities.

See CP, Goal CFU 5, Environmental Concerns.

The policies underlying this goal also demonstrate that the project fulfills the intent of the comprehensive plan by controlling the impacts of runoff and overflows. Policy CFU 5.3, Stormwater, provides: "Implement a Stormwater Management Plan to reduce impacts from urban runoff." In the discussion of that policy, the following objective is stated: "...the City of Spokane should work continuously toward the reduction of existing combined sewer overflows wherever technically, economically, and environmentally appropriate." See CP, Chapter 5, p. 19.

The Hearing Examiner finds that the project is consistent with the goals and policies of the comprehensive plan, and therefore this criterion is satisfied.

3. *The proposal meets the concurrency requirements of Chapter 17D.010SMC. See SMC 17G.060.170(C)(3).*

The decision criteria for Type III decisions (such as a conditional use permit) mandate that any proposal satisfy the concurrency requirements under SMC 17D.010. See SMC 17G.060.170(C)(3). In addition, under the concurrency standards, facilities for public wastewater

(sewer and stormwater) must be evaluated for concurrency. See SMC 17D.010.010(I). Accordingly, on April 19, 2016, a Request for Comments on the application was circulated to all City departments and outside agencies with jurisdiction. See Exhibit 20.

The city received minimal response to its request for comments. See e.g. Exhibits 3, 3A, 4A, & 4B. City staff noted that "...there were no departments or agencies that reported that concurrency could not be achieved." See Exhibit 1, p. 4. To the extent that there was a lack of substantive comments from departments and agencies with jurisdiction, the Hearing Examiner must conclude that concurrency standards are satisfied. See SMC 17D.010.020(B)(1).

A review of the record confirms that there is no substantive evidence that the project transgresses any concurrency requirements. There was no testimony at the public hearing suggesting that the concurrency standards would not be satisfied. The proposal, by its nature, does not place substantive demands on public infrastructure. The project does not have any discernible effect on public services such as fire, police, or schools. See Exhibit 15 (Environmental Checklist ¶ B(15)). If anything, the proposal improves public facilities by increasing the city's capacity to handle wastewater.

The Hearing Examiner finds that the project satisfies the concurrency requirements of the municipal code. Therefore, this criterion for approval of the conditional use permit is met.

4. *If approval of a site plan is required, the property is suitable for the proposed use and site plan considering the physical characteristics of the property, including but not limited to size, shape, location, topography, soils, slope, drainage characteristics, the existence of ground or surface water and the existence of natural, historic or cultural features. See SMC 17G.060.170(C)(4).*

The site plan for the project is included in the record as Exhibits 2E-1 through 2E-3. The site plan, along with other documents in the record, describes the location, size, shape, and topography of the property. These documents also include information about the physical characteristics of the site and details about the proposed project. A review of this documentation confirms that the project site is suitable for the proposed use.

The site is an undeveloped and unused low area, largely unseen from any street. See Exhibit 1, p. 4. The western portion of the site is gently sloping, with a grade of 10% or less. See Exhibit 1, p. 4. The eastern portion of the site is significantly sloped, with the grade ranging from 16% to 30%. See *id.* However, the proposed tank will be constructed and installed in the flat area of the site. See *id.* The tank will be installed entirely underground. See *id.* The adjacent swale will be installed in the steeper portion of the site.

After the tank is installed, the site will be restored with native vegetation. *Testimony of D. Buller.* The project will only modestly increase the impervious surfaces at the site. See Exhibit 1, p. 4. Storm water will be treated and disposed of on-site through the proposed swale. See Exhibit 1, p. 4.

There is no evidence of surface waters on the project site. Geotechnical borings were completed up to 60 feet in depth without encountering groundwater. See Exhibit 15 (Environmental Checklist ¶ A(14)(b)(1)). It is believed that groundwater levels are over 100 feet in depth. See *id.* In addition, there "...are no surface indications of unstable soils." See Exhibit

15 (Environmental Checklist ¶ B(1)(d)).

There are no known cultural or historic resources on this site. See Exhibit 15 (Environmental Checklist ¶ B(13)(a)-(b)). The city has completed a cultural resource assessment and no such resources were discovered. See Exhibit 3A. There are no buildings on the site, and therefore there are no historic structures that could be impacted by the project. The Spokane Tribe of Indians provided a comment on this project, but did not identify any specific reason to believe that historical, cultural, or archaeological resources are or are likely to be at this site. See Exhibit 3. Under the circumstances, the Hearing Examiner will include the usual condition that if, during excavation, any significant resources are discovered, the appropriate protocol will be followed. That is sufficient given this record, in the Hearing Examiner's opinion.

The Hearing Examiner concludes that the property is suitable for the proposed use, given the conditions and characteristics of the site. As a result, this criterion is satisfied.

5. *The proposal will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment or the surrounding properties, and if necessary conditions can be placed on the proposal to avoid significant effect or interference with the use of neighboring property or the surrounding area, considering the design and intensity of the proposed use. See SMC 17G.060.170(C)(5).*

The environmental review process, completed pursuant to the State Environmental Policy Act, demonstrates that the project will not have significant environmental impacts. To the extent certain impacts occur or may occur, those impacts can be addressed adequately through appropriate mitigation measures.

On or about March 14, 2016, the City of Spokane prepared a SEPA checklist for this project. See Exhibit 15 (Environmental Checklist). The checklist supports the conclusion that this project will not have significant impacts on the environment or the surrounding properties. For example, there are no wetlands or streams on the site, although the project is near the Spokane River. See Exhibit 15 (Environmental Checklist ¶ B(3)(a)(1)-(2)). The property does not lie within a 100-year floodplain. See Exhibit 15 (Environmental Checklist ¶ B(3)(a)(5)). No waste materials will be discharged into the ground or into surface waters as a result of this project. See Exhibit 15 (Environmental Checklist ¶¶ B(3)(b)(2) & B(3)(c)(2)). No environmental hazards (e.g. exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire or explosion, hazardous wastes, etc.) are anticipated to arise due to this project. See Exhibit 15 (Environmental Checklist ¶ B(7)(a)). No threatened or endangered species were identified on the site. See Exhibit 15 (Environmental Checklist ¶¶ B(4)(c) & B(5)(b)).

On March 24, 2016, the Department of Engineering Services of the City of Spokane, as lead agency, issued a Determination of Non-significance ("DNS") for the project. See Exhibit 14. Any appeal of the DNS was due on April 7, 2016. See *id.* No appeal of the DNS was filed.

It should be acknowledged that site proximity to the Spokane River does give rise to some concern. The construction project will involve substantial work on the site. However, the construction site is approximately about 1,000 feet northeast of the Spokane River. See Exhibit 15 (Environmental Checklist ¶ B(3)(a)(1)-(2)). The distance between the river and the construction work will, to a large degree, eliminate the likelihood of significant impacts to the

river. To the extent the construction activity poses any risks, the mitigation measures should address the possible impacts. In addition, the impacts from construction will be temporary. Once the construction is completed, most of the site will be replanted with native grasses. See Exhibit 1, p. 5. Drip-irrigated trees will also be planted. See *id.* Since the tank is underground, the long-term visual impacts of the project will be minimal. There is no reason to believe that the ordinary mitigation measures for construction projects will not suffice in this case.

There is no substantive evidence that the project should not be permitted due to environmental impacts. The SEPA process clearly supports the premise that the project will not have significant impacts on the environment. No one appealed the DNS. Further, there was no testimony or evidence at the public hearing establishing that there were significant impacts overlooked in the SEPA review. And, ultimately, the CSO project will help reduce sewage emissions into the Spokane River, most likely creating a positive environmental benefit.

For the foregoing reasons, the Hearing Examiner concludes that the project will not have significant impacts on the environment, which cannot be adequately addressed through mitigation. Therefore, this criterion for approval of the conditional use permit is satisfied.

6. *The overall residential appearance and function of the area will not be significantly lessened due to the construction of utilities and infrastructure. The project will not result in the construction of improvements that are disproportionate to the residential household uses in the surrounding area. See SMC 17C.320.080(F).*

This project will not negatively impact the residential appearance or function of the area. There will be virtually no indication of the presence of the CSO tank. The tank will be installed entirely underground. See Exhibit 1, p. 6. The project does not include any buildings that would detract from the residential character of the neighborhood, or which could be considered disproportionate or incongruous. A swale will be added, but that should not significantly change the visual character of the site. See *id.* In addition, the site will be replanted with native grasses and trees to restore its character. Existing trees also provide a natural screen of the site. See *id.* When the project is completed, the site will appear essentially the same as it did prior to the development. The Hearing Examiner concludes that this criterion for approval is met.

7. *The proposal will be compatible with the adjacent residential developments based on characteristics such as the site size, building scale and style, setbacks and landscaping. The proposal will mitigate the differences in appearance or scale through such means as setbacks, screening, landscaping and other design features. See SMC 17C.320.080(F)(2).*

The CSO tank will be completely buried and thus not visible to neighbors or others near the site. See Exhibit 1, p. 6. There are no other structures or buildings proposed that could be considered incompatible with nearby residences. See *id.* In addition, the preceding discussion, demonstrating that the project does not materially impact residential uses, applies here as well. There will also be a new, shared-use path installed at the site, which provides a public benefit that does not currently exist. See *id.* The Hearing Examiner concludes that the project is compatible with surrounding residential developments, and is well designed to mitigate any potential impacts.

8. *The proposal will not have significant adverse impacts on the livability of nearby residential lands due to noise, glare, late-night operations, odors and litter, or privacy and safety issues. See SMC 17C.320.080(F)(3).*

The operation of the underground utility, by its nature, will have little to no impact on nearby residents. As stated previously, once the construction work is completed, the site will appear nearly the same as it did before the project.

The tank is underground. There are no above-ground buildings. Thus, there are no visual impacts anticipated from this project. See Exhibit 15 (Environmental Checklist ¶ B(10)). Operational activity on the site will be of very low intensity, and traffic to this type of utility is typically de minimis. See Exhibit 15 (Environmental Checklist ¶ B(14)). There are no lights proposed for the project. See Exhibit 1, p. 6. No light or glare will be generated by this project. See Exhibit 15 (Environmental Checklist ¶ B(11)). There will be no operations carried on at the site that would result in noise, glare, odors, litter, or similar impacts. See Exhibit 1, p. 6. There was no testimony or evidence offered at the public hearing to suggest that such impacts were a probable result of this project.

The only apparent source of noise would be by construction activities. See Exhibit 1, p. 6. However, the construction noise is temporary, and will cease when the project is completed. See Exhibit 15 (Environmental Checklist ¶ B(7)(b)).

The proposal itself does not raise any concerns about privacy or safety, and there was no evidence or testimony suggesting any ways in which the CSO tank could create such concerns.

The Hearing Examiner concludes that this criterion for approval has been satisfied.

- 9. The proposed use is in conformance with the street designations of the transportation element of the comprehensive plan. The transportation system is capable of supporting the proposed use in addition to existing uses in the area, upon consideration of the evaluation factors provided in the municipal code. See SMC 17C.320.080(F)(4).*

The proposal is to construct utility infrastructure. As a result, factors such as connectivity, circulation, and transit availability are not particularly relevant to the proposal or the nature of the use. Almost no traffic is generated from this utility operation. See Exhibit 15 (Environmental Checklist ¶ B(14)). The area transportation system therefore easily accommodates the proposed use.

As discussed above on the issue of concurrency, there are adequate public services to support the proposed use. In fact, with respect to the management of wastewater, the project is intended to increase the capacity and performance of public services.

The proposal is consistent with the transportation element of the comprehensive plan, and therefore this criterion to approve a conditional use is satisfied.

DECISION

Based on the findings and conclusions above, it is the decision of the Hearing Examiner to approve the proposed conditional use permit subject to the following conditions:

1. Approval is for a conditional use permit to allow the City of Spokane to construct an underground tank to be used as a combined sewer overflow prevention tank by the City of

Spokane Wastewater Department. The tank will be constructed substantially as set forth in the application and plans included in the record.

2. The project will be developed in substantial conformance with SMC 17C.110.500, Land Use Standards, Residential Zones, Institutional Design Standards, to maintain compatibility with and limit the negative impacts on surrounding residential areas.

3. All parking and maneuvering areas must be paved per SMC 17C.230.140C.

4. The applicant will re-vegetate the site following the construction work, with the intent to restore the site as a natural open space.

5. If any artifacts or human remains are found upon excavation, the Spokane Tribe of Indians and the City of Spokane Planning & Development Services should be immediately notified and the work in the immediate area cease. Pursuant to RCW 27.53.060 it is unlawful to destroy any historic or prehistoric archaeological resources. RCW 27.44 and RCW 27.53.060 require that a person obtain a permit from the Washington State Department of Archaeology & Historic Preservation before excavating, removing or altering Native American human remains or archaeological resources in Washington.

6. This approval does not waive the applicant's obligation to comply with all of the requirements of the Spokane Municipal Code including the building codes, as well as requirements of City Departments and outside agencies with jurisdiction over land development.

7. This project must adhere to any additional performance and development standards documented in comments or required by the City of Spokane, the County of Spokane, the State of Washington, and any federal agency.

8. A Notice of Construction and Application for Approval shall be submitted and approved by the Spokane Regional Clean Air Agency prior to the construction, installation, or establishment of an air pollution source and Notice of Intent shall be submitted to Spokane Clean Air prior to any demolition project or asbestos project.

9. Spokane Municipal Code section 17G.060.240 regulates the expiration of this approval, and Table 17G.060-3 sets forth the time frame for the expiration of all approvals.

10. This approval is subject to the above-stated conditions. By accepting this approval the applicant acknowledges that these conditions are reasonable and agrees to comply with them. The filing of the above required covenant constitutes the applicant's written agreement to comply with all conditions of approval. The property may not be developed except in accordance with these conditions and failure to comply with them may result in the revocation of this approval.

DATED this 6th day of July, 2016.



Brian T. McGinn
City of Spokane Hearing Examiner

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

Appeals of decisions by the Hearing Examiner are governed by Spokane Municipal Code 17G.060.210 and 17G.050.

Decisions by the Hearing Examiner regarding conditional use permits and variances are final. They may be appealed by any party of record by filing a Land Use Petition with the Superior Court of Spokane County. **THE LAND USE PETITION MUST BE FILED AND THE CITY OF SPOKANE MUST BE SERVED WITHIN TWENTY-ONE (21) CALENDAR DAYS OF THE DATE OF THE ISSUANCE OF THE DECISION.** Pursuant to RCW 36.70C.040(4)(a), the date of the issuance of the decision is the date the decision is entered into the public record. This decision was entered into the public record on July 6, 2016. **THEREFORE, THE DATE OF THE LAST DAY TO APPEAL IS THE 27th DAY OF JULY 2016 AT 5:00 P.M.**

In addition to paying any Court costs to appeal the decision, the ordinance requires payment of a transcript fee to the City of Spokane to cover the costs of preparing a verbatim transcript and otherwise preparing a full record for the Court.

Pursuant to RCW 36.70B.130, affected property owners may request a change in valuation for property tax purposes notwithstanding any program of revaluation.