

August 3, 2021

**OFFICE OF THE HEARING EXAMINER  
KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON**

King County Courthouse  
516 Third Avenue Room 1200  
Seattle, Washington 98104  
Telephone (206) 477-0860  
[hearingexaminer@kingcounty.gov](mailto:hearingexaminer@kingcounty.gov)  
[www.kingcounty.gov/independent/hearing-examiner](http://www.kingcounty.gov/independent/hearing-examiner)

**REPORT AND DECISION**

SUBJECT: Department of Local Services file nos. **ENFR180277 and SWO**

**DOUGLAS AND SUSAN HOFFMANN**

Code Enforcement Appeal

Location: [REDACTED] Vashon

Appellants: **Douglas and Susan Hoffmann**

[REDACTED]  
Vashon, WA 98070

Telephone: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Intervenor: **Scott Engelhard**

[REDACTED]  
Vashon, WA 98070

Telephone: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

King County: Department of Local Services  
*represented by* **Nick Stephens**  
Department of Local Services  
35030 SE Douglas Street Suite 210  
Snoqualmie, WA 98065  
Telephone: (206) 477-3950  
Email: [nick.stephens@kingcounty.gov](mailto:nick.stephens@kingcounty.gov)

## FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

### Overview

1. Douglas Hoffmann appeals the latest Department of Local Services notice and order, along with a stop work order. While the violation was massive, reshaping a large swath of his property without the necessary permits, the crux of our dispute is narrow: in all that clearing and grinding and filling, did Mr. Hoffmann encroach into critical area buffers established via an earlier permit? After hearing the witnesses' testimony and observing their demeanor, studying the exhibits admitted into evidence, and considering the parties' arguments and the relevant law, we find that Local Services has not proven that the clearing and grading violation encroached into a critical area buffer, other than the obvious critical aquifer recharge area that underlays all of Vashon Island.

### Background

2. In 2009, Local Services received complaints about activities on the Hoffmann property and opened a code enforcement action, E0900317. That same year, Mr. Hoffmann applied for permit L09CG298.
3. In 2011, that permit was approved. There is no question that the permit legalized extensive grading that Mr. Hoffmann had previously done (without first obtaining the necessary permits) and set the boundaries for various critical area buffers. After the six-year retention period ended, Local Services purged its records associated with L09CG298, and Mr. Hoffmann did not retain a copy. The absence of the L09CG298 file means there is nothing definitively showing exactly what pre-2011 clearing and grading was legalized or where the permit established the critical area buffer boundaries to be.
4. The permit did not resolve all the outstanding violations, and in October 2014, Local Services served a notice and order under E0900317, asserting (1) operation of a materials processing facility and/or materials processing for personal use and in critical areas, and (2) construction of an accessory structure within critical areas, all without the necessary permits. Mr. Hoffmann appealed, and we went to hearing in January 2015.<sup>1</sup>
5. We found Mr. Hoffmann was conducting a materials processing business in the back area, a use disallowed in that zone, and at a scope far exceeding any allowed home occupation use. We also found that, as the building had been up for several years, it was not temporary but permanent, and required a permit, sustaining that violation also. However, Local Services did not prove that either violation occurred in any critical area buffer (erosion hazard, landslide hazard, and aquatic), other than being in a critical aquifer recharge area (as all of Vashon is). We required that, by April 2015, Mr. Hoffmann take down the structure or apply for a building permit, and that he cease any materials processing and remove the related equipment from the back area, except that for up to eight hours on one day each calendar year he could process organic materials

---

<sup>1</sup> [https://kingcounty.gov/~media/independent/hearing-examiner/documents/case-digest/appeals/code-enforcement/2015/E09001317\\_Hoffmann.ashx?la=en](https://kingcounty.gov/~media/independent/hearing-examiner/documents/case-digest/appeals/code-enforcement/2015/E09001317_Hoffmann.ashx?la=en).

- on the subject property, so long as the resulting mulch was used on the subject property or their adjacent homesite.
6. Later that year, Local Services issued penalties for failing to meet those requirements and deadlines. Mr. Hoffmann appealed, and we went to hearing in December 2015. We overturned the penalty related to materials processing. As to the structure, rather than apply for a permit or remove it, Mr. Hoffmann simply took off its covering, then argued that this made it a “structure” and not a “building,” and thus he no longer needed to take it down. As that argument was doomed (the orders were for a “structure,” which encompasses more than just buildings), he pivoted to an argument that he had moved the structure a few feet, and thus it was no longer “permanent.” We rejected both those arguments and upheld most of those penalties.<sup>2</sup>
  7. In 2018, Local Services received additional complaints and opened the present enforcement action for activities related to the backside of his property.
  8. Mr. Hoffmann was busy on the front side of his property too, bringing in asphalt grindings and drawing a May 2019 notice and order (ENFR190332). That notice and order was appealed to us, but we have stayed ENFR190332, as at least a portion of that dispute moved directly to superior court.
  9. Returning to today’s case, ENFR180277, Local Services’ October 2019 notice and order asserted that, beyond the clearing and grading legalized by L09CG298, Mr. Hoffmann cleared over 7000 additional square feet, and graded over 2000 cubic yards in the form of dirt mixed with stumps, cut brush, and branches, both without permits and within environmentally critical areas or their buffers. The notice and order also asserted that Mr. Hoffmann once again constructed an accessory structure without the required permits and was once again operating an illegal business, this time storing contracting materials on site.
  10. When that did not get Mr. Hoffmann to cease activities, Local Services served a stop work order in January 2020. Mr. Hoffmann timely appealed those. We later granted neighbor Scott Engelhard’s petition to intervene.
  11. Mr. Hoffmann did not dispute that his work since 2011 triggered the need to apply for a clearing and grading permit. (The other major trigger, in addition to 7000 ft.<sup>2</sup> of clearing and 2000 yd.<sup>3</sup> of new impervious surface, is new fill exceeding 100 yd.<sup>3</sup>) His own permit application estimated that he imported 1,500 yd.<sup>3</sup> of fill and ground up wood creating 350 yd.<sup>3</sup> of mulch (many multiples of the 100 yd.<sup>3</sup> threshold triggering a permit), along with clearing 32,800 ft.<sup>2</sup> (many multiples the 7000 ft.<sup>2</sup> permit trigger). Ex. A8.
  12. Instead, our dispute is a narrow one. Local Services asserted that a small portion of that work was performed in critical areas or their buffers, and thus constituted a critical areas violation. Mr. Hoffmann maintained that his post-2011 work has not extended beyond

---

<sup>2</sup> See [https://kingcounty.gov/~media/independent/hearing-examiner/documents/case-digest/appeals/other/2015/E0900317\\_Hoffmann.ashx?la=en](https://kingcounty.gov/~media/independent/hearing-examiner/documents/case-digest/appeals/other/2015/E0900317_Hoffmann.ashx?la=en).

the lateral limits of the critical area boundaries established by L09CG298, and thus was not a critical areas violation.

13. That is crucial, because when Mr. Hoffmann submitted his clearing and grading permit application, Local Services found his application incomplete because, among other shortcomings, it did not contain a critical areas study. A critical areas study is required if Mr. Hoffmann has encroached into critical areas or their buffer, beyond those boundaries set by L09CG298. Conversely, if he has stayed completely on his side of the 2011 boundary line, he does not need to undertake a critical areas study. It was that dispute that necessitated our July 20 hearing.

### Hearing

14. Local Services' representative, Nick Stephens, agreed at the outset that, at some point between issuing its notice order and our hearing, Mr. Hoffmann removed the accessory structure and contracting material and equipment he was storing at the back of the site. Exs. D10 & D11. Those violations are now in compliance.
15. Laura Casey, a recently-retired Local Services scientist, was a reviewer on the L09CG298 permit. She visited the site, but during this stage of review before any buffer boundaries would have been set or marked. Ms. Casey agreed that if the County had flagged the edge of critical area buffers, that would be the edge of the allowed clearing and grading going forward. However, she noted that, in addition to the buffer itself, there is a 15-foot building setback line beyond that buffer. Even if the retaining wall/berm Mr. Hoffmann erected, exhibits I49 and I50, did not itself encroach into a critical area buffer, it might still violate building setback reviews; permit review will need to analyze this.
16. Sheryl Lux, who was the code enforcement officer on E0900317 and visited the site during that case, did not remember any pink flags, only a silt fence. She explained how she concluded that Mr. Hoffmann had encroached something like 13 feet into what she surmised was the critical area buffer boundary marked off L09CG298. Ex. D7. She opined that it was possible Mr. Hoffmann had himself crated an additional steep slope with his berm, which could impact the slope or create an additional slide hazard.
17. Nick Stephens testified that, based on Ms. Lux's pictures and comments, Mr. Hoffmann exceeded the L09CG298-established boundaries, with the retaining wall appearing to be inside the actual buffer. He agreed that the aerial mapping is not exact.
18. Mr. Engelhard explained how he shot his numerous photos and videos. As shown in the topographic map, the Hoffmann property had been sloping, but with all the work Mr. Hoffmann undertook, it is now mostly flat. He showed how Mr. Hoffmann created a retaining wall and filled that area in. Exs. I49-I50. He documented Mr. Hoffmann's activities after the stop work order was issued in January 2020; he surmised that Mr. Hoffmann imported (and then ground up) new materials after that date, given the huge pile shown in the March 2020 photos that later disappeared. He explained why he concludes that Mr. Hoffmann has graded within the buffers.

19. Neighbor Travis Tuchak lives across the ravine from the Hoffmanns running heavy equipment. He described the noise he hears from Mr. Hoffmann's operations, a near constant stream that can go on for eight-plus hours. When that work is occurring, he can only conduct a conversation on his porch by yelling at the person next to him.
20. Kerri Grace described seeing huge piles forming on the Hoffmann property, then those piles going away. That cycle repeated itself over and over again. She feels like she is living in an industrial area, noise-wise.
21. Mr. Hoffmann explained how he and Local Services' inspector Fred White walked the property during the L09CG298 and agreed on critical area buffer boundaries, which Mr. Hoffmann marked off with pink tape. Mr. Hoffmann asserts that he has stayed out of those areas in the years since. He has graded out his property on the upland side of the line, although he still wants to import even more material he can grade into chips to stabilize the surface of that work. He has not brought in any more materials from off-site since the stop work order was issued in January 2020.
22. Mr. Hoffmann explained that he brought materials (earth and wood) to his property because he wanted to create a level pasture; he wants his property to look a certain way. If he had not gotten those materials from his own jobsites, he would have gotten them from somewhere else. He agrees he has changed the topography of his property. Other than some logs he cut into firewood, and maybe a few logs fashioned into benches, the material has all remained on site.

### Analysis

23. Our issue is not whether the critical area buffer boundaries set during the L09CG298 permit review were objectively correct. It would appear from the mapping that some buffer may extend further upland from even the edge of the work conducted pre-2011, let alone into the post-2011 activity area. Ex. D7 at 002; Lux testimony. But, for good, bad, or ugly, L09CG298 set boundaries, and that permit was finalized in 2011. So, our question is limited to whether Mr. Hoffmann has since encroached into those defined boundaries.
24. As to Mr. Hoffmann's post-2011 activities, Mr. Engelhard summed things up accurately: Mr. Hoffmann went hog wild, bringing in mountains of excavation debris, then processed those and graded out the property, creating a massive topographical change. Mr. Engelhard and other neighbors want use and enjoyment of the property, which Mr. Hoffmann has incessantly deprived them of via years of grinding and grading.
25. We would go farther than that. Mr. Hoffmann shows no concern for his neighbors, continually flashing them a virtual middle finger with industrial-level work producing construction-site level noise, without first obtaining the necessary permits to make that work legal. He brought in enormous quantities of wood and earthen materials and completely reshaped the entire landscape by tens of thousands of square feet, changing the vegetation and topography in colossal ways. *See, e.g.*, Exs. D7, D9 & D12; Exs. I1-I5; I22, I25, I27, I39, I42.

26. Mr. Hoffmann has consistently tried to game the system, getting away with as much as he can for as long as he can. In E0900317, rather than get a permit for the structure or remove it, as he was ordered to, he tried to sneak around that requirement by removing the building's covering and moving it, then arguing that these moves technically absolved him of responsibility. In the current case he again constructed an accessory structure without permits and again used the property for equipment and material storage, then removed those before the hearing, thus coming into compliance with no repercussions. In his permit application, Mr. Hoffmann attempted to cross out required reviews and associated fees. Ex. A8. In the lead up to our hearing, Mr. Hoffmann cited a 2003 examiner decision interpreting what was then a definition of fill to argue that his massive piling of his ground down does count as "fill."<sup>3</sup>
27. But here the allegation is that Mr. Hoffmann saw the buffer boundaries and then encroached into them...by only the length of an average car?<sup>4</sup> And then he doubled down on that line by constructing a retaining wall that looks like a mediaeval battlement, and then tripled down on the line by backfilling that wall with tons of material...yet he selected a line a few feet into the buffer to build his barricade? Ex. I49-I50. That makes zero internal sense.
28. Mr. Hoffmann seems to be constantly trying to pull a fast one, often getting away with it. But no one has asserted that he is stupid or naïve; he knows what he is doing. And gaining a few lateral feet of space (as opposed to the massive reshaping of the upland portions of the property he has wrought) at the cost of putting himself in what he knows would be critical areas violation box he would not soon extricate himself from? That is difficult to fathom and not at all in keeping with the rest of this saga the neighbors have had to endure.
29. We would have far less trouble envisioning the scenario where, for example, Mr. Hoffmann dumped truckloads of stumps down the ravine and argued that those were not "fill," or cleared a huge swath of vegetation in the buffer and then claimed he was allowed to do that because the vegetation was invasive and thus exempt. But erecting a virtual fortification, yet doing that just a couple of feet over the boundary he had walked with Mr. White? That would be completely inconsistent with the scale of everything that has occurred to date.
30. In the end, we conclude that Local Services has not met its burden of showing that the clearing and grading violation, major as it is, encroached into the critical area buffers set by L09CG298. There is currently no critical areas violation, and thus his permit application is not incomplete because it is missing a critical areas study.

---

<sup>3</sup> Mr. Hoffmann cites a 2003 examiner decision interpreting what was then a definition of fill as "earth material," with the examiner's determination turning on whether that appellant's piles were "primarily earth material." Ex. A5. However, by at least 2008, "fill" was defined more broadly as "a deposit of earth material or recycled or reprocessed waste material consisting primarily of organic or earthen materials, or any combination thereof, placed by mechanical means." KCC 16.82.020.L.

<sup>4</sup> Per J.D. Power, the average car is around 14.7 feet. The line on Local Services map was 13.6 feet, although it appears a little wider west of that. Ex. D7 at 003.

### Stop Work Order

31. In addition to the three notice and order-related violations discussed above, Mr. Hoffmann also appealed a January 2020 stop work order for continuing to stockpile fill and material without permits, inspections or approvals. Unlike a notice and order, a stop work order is not stayed because an appeal is lodged. *Compare* KCC 23.36.020.B & .C. Violation of a stop work order can be a violation separate from other civil code violations, with separate civil penalties. KCC 23.28.030.C; 23.32.010.c.1.
32. We noted this as an issue for hearing. Mr. Hoffmann and Mr. Engelhard addressed this topic; Local Services did not. While Local Services retains prosecutorial discretion on what to pursue or not pursue, it would have been helpful for Local Services to provide at least some perspective, instead of staying silent.
33. Reflecting on the topic since the hearing, we realize that, given the present procedural posture here, the only stop work item definitely ripe for decision is *Mr. Hoffmann's* challenge to the stop work order itself; that is, was the stop work order issued in error? We find that Local Services properly issued the stop work order. But our July 20 hearing was *not* a scenario where, say, Local Services issued penalties because it concluded Mr. Hoffmann violated that stop work order itself and assessed penalties, and Mr. Hoffmann timely appealed, asserting that he had not violated the stop work order, and we had to decide the matter.
34. If in the future Local Services asserted that Mr. Hoffmann violated the stop work order (either to date, or in the future, up until permits are obtained and the stop work order is lifted), there would two issues, a legal one and a factual one.
35. Legally, the stop work order was for “continuing to stockpile fill & material without permits, inspections or approvals related to case #ENFR180277.” Ex. D5. At hearing, Mr. Hoffmann explained that he interpreted that as meaning he could not import any new fill or materials, but not restricting him from continuing to work with the materials already onsite. That is a narrow interpretation of the scope of the order, compared to a broader view that *all* work related to the fill and materials had to stop until permits were obtained. Local Services did not comment on the scope of its order, and we make no conclusions on what it barred.
36. Factually, Mr. Engelhard contends that Mr. Hoffmann continued to import stumps and other materials after January 23, 2020, and he provided some evidentiary support for this proposition. Testimony; Exs. I36-37. If so, that would be a violation even under Mr. Hoffmann’s narrow interpretation of the scope of the stop work order. Mr. Hoffmann denies he imported anything after the stop work order was posted. We enter no factual findings on this topic.

### Materials Processing

37. Another item Local Services did not pursue, much to the neighbor’s consternation, is a materials processing business. It was not a violation listed in either the October 2019 notice and order or January 2020 stop work order, and thus was not an item Mr.

Hoffmann could have appealed. Mr. Hoffmann’s work was certainly a violation, both because he greatly exceeded the eight hours on one day in any calendar year we decreed in our January 2015 decision that Mr. Hoffmann could conduct materials processing on the site for personal use (so long as the resulting material stays on site), and because he massively exceeded the quantities that triggered the need to apply for a permit before undertaking the work.

38. However, having reviewed the evidence in today’s record, it is not so clear whether his recent endeavors would more accurately be classified as a business use or a residential use. This is not the purely transactional asphalt pilings (ENFR190332) Mr. Hoffmann (legally or illegally) deposited at the front of his property as part of a commercial endeavor, with the intent to reuse those on another jobsite(s). For the back of the property, Mr. Hoffmann imported enormous quantities of earth and organic material from various job sites. Mr. Engelhard argues that, as Mr. Hoffmann charged customers a tip fee, he was just dumping it on his property to save on disposal costs (a business use). Mr. Hoffmann counters that he brought them on to reshape his property to look how he wants it to look, and with the goal of eventually constructing a home (a residential use).
39. Is that a business use (Mr. Hoffmann wanted a cheap place to dump his commercial clearing and grading detritus) or a residential use (Mr. Hoffmann wants his residential property look a certain way, an endeavor his readily-available source of fill material from his jobsites merely facilitated)? We make no findings on that topic. Again, the work was illegal on multiple levels, but Local Services was not necessarily incorrect to refrain from citing Mr. Hoffmann for conduction an illegal materials processing *business*.

### Next Steps

40. Mr. Stephens stated at the end of hearing that the critical areas study was the only major piece missing from Mr. Hoffmann’s application. If that is accurate, then the ball is already on Local Services’ court, and there is nothing currently for Mr. Hoffmann to submit. However, as of February, Local Services’ Jon Pederson noted that Mr. Hoffmann’s application was missing—in addition to the critical areas study—a clearing/grading permit application worksheet, an adequate site plan on the standard site plan template, a SEPA checklist, and SEPA and other review fees revised to reflect 2021 fees. (Mr. Hoffmann had crossed out fees he thought were unnecessary. Ex. A8.) It is possible that, in the interim, Mr. Hoffmann submitted all the outstanding items *other* than the critical areas study. To avoid further delays related to who is waiting on who, Local Services should verify this.
41. Finally, our finding no current critical areas violation—in the sense that there is insufficient proof that Mr. Hoffmann’s clearing/grading/retaining wall/earth moving encroached into the critical area buffer boundaries set by L09CG298—does not mean that he will be able to keep the berm/retaining wall or the fill it is holding up. As Ms. Casey pointed out, in addition to the critical area buffers themselves, there is an *additional* 15-foot building setback line; permit review will be required to determine whether what Mr. Hoffmann constructed is allowed within the building setback. In addition, there is a slapdash quality to his creation; whether the construction is sufficient, or whether (as the




wood rots over time) material is likely to impermissibly spill into the critical area buffer, may be another item for permit review. Other than finding that Mr. Hoffmann does not need to submit a critical areas study to make his permit application complete, we place no other caveats on the permit process.

DECISION:

1. We uphold the October 2019 notice and order and January 2020 stop work order in that Local Services has shown clearing and grading far exceeding the permit thresholds, all without the necessary permits. Conversely, Local Services has not shown that any of the post-2011 work encroached into critical area buffers beyond the boundaries set by the set by L09CG298. Mr. Hoffmann does not need to submit a critical areas study for his application to be deemed complete.
2. Because, prior to hearing, Mr. Hoffmann had removed the accessory structure and contracting materials listed in the October 2019 notice and order, those violations are in compliance.
3. By **August 20, 2021**, Local Services shall send Mr. Hoffmann a revised list of (any) incomplete items on his grading permit application, along with reasonable deadlines for Mr. Hoffmann to submit that supplementary material.
4. Thereafter, Mr. Hoffmann shall meet all the permit-related deadlines. No penalties shall be assessed against the Hoffmanns or the subject property, if the permit application is followed-through and timely completed. If not, Local Services may issue penalties retroactive to today.
5. Finally, the current stop work order and our 2015 order are still in effect, until modified by a future permit. Mr. Hoffman may bring no more materials onto the property until he obtains a permit, and, unless modified by a permit, any materials processing onsite is limited to a single day each calendar year of no more than eight hours, so long as the resulting product is used on the subject property. And we note that even those eight hours are not necessarily a safe harbor. That was our order from 2015. Depending on how one reads the scope of Local Services' January 2020 stop work order, even that grinding may be a violation.

ORDERED August 3, 2021.



---

David Spohr  
Hearing Examiner

## NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

King County Code 20.22.040 directs the Examiner to make the County’s final decision for this type of case. This decision shall be final and conclusive unless proceedings for review of the decision are timely and properly commenced in superior court. Appeals are governed by the Land Use Petition Act, Chapter 36.70C RCW.

### MINUTES OF THE JULY 20, 2021, HEARING IN THE APPEAL OF DOUGLAS AND SUSAN HOFFMANN, DEPARTMENT OF LOCAL SERVICES FILE NOS. ENFR180277 AND SWO

David Spohr was the Hearing Examiner in this matter. Participating in the hearing were Nick Stephens, Scott Engelhard, Douglas Hoffmann, Laura Casey, Sheryl Lux, Travis Tuchak, and Kerri Grace. A verbatim recording of the hearing is available in the Hearing Examiner’s Office.

The following exhibits were offered and entered into the record by the Department:

Exhibit no. D1	Department of Local Services staff report to the Hearing Examiner
Exhibit no. D2	Notice and order, issued October 31, 2019
Exhibit no. D3	Appeal, received November 25, 2019
Exhibit no. D4	Codes cited in the notice and order
Exhibit no. D5	STOP WORK ORDER, dated January 23, 2020
Exhibit no. D6	Comments for permit submittal requirements from Laura Casey, dated September 19, 2018
Exhibit no. D7	Exhibit from Sheryl Lux
Exhibit no. D8	Pre-Application notes from meeting held March 1, 2019 for PREA18-0195
Exhibit no. D9	Photographs of subject property, dated May 1, 2018
Exhibit no. D10	Aerial photographs showing equipment storage and removal, dated 2019 and 2021
Exhibit no. D11	Aerial photographs showing accessory structure and removal
Exhibit no. D12	Aerial photographs of subject property, dated 2009
Exhibit no. D13	Aerial photographs of subject property, dated 2012
Exhibit no. D14	Aerial photographs of subject property, dated 2013
Exhibit no. D15	Aerial photographs of subject property, dated 2017
Exhibit no. D16	Aerial photographs of subject property, dated 2019
Exhibit no. D17	Aerial photographs of subject property, dated 2021
Exhibit no. D18	Officer Stephens email response, dated July 12, 2021

The following exhibits were offered and entered into the record by the appellant:

Exhibit no. A1	Aerial photograph, dated June 13, 2021
Exhibit no. A2	Aerial photograph, dated June 13, 2021
Exhibit no. A3	Aerial photograph, dated June 13, 2021
Exhibit no. A4	Aerial photograph, dated June 13, 2021
Exhibit no. A5	Hearing Examiner Report and Decision, dated May 7, 2003

Exhibit no. A6	Witness List
Exhibit no. A7	Douglas Hoffmann email response, dated July 9, 2021
Exhibit no. A8	Permit application materials

The following exhibits were offered and entered into the record by the intervenor:

Exhibit no. I1	Topographical map of property prior to grading
Exhibit no. I2	iMap 2007
Exhibit no. I3	iMap 2013
Exhibit no. I4	iMap 2015
Exhibit no. I5	iMap 2017
Exhibit no. I7	Photograph, dated February 17, 2017
Exhibit no. I8	Photograph, dated February 17, 2017
Exhibit no. I9	Photograph, dated March 15, 2018
Exhibit no. I10	Video, dated March 15, 2018
Exhibit no. I11	Video, dated March 15, 2018
Exhibit no. I12	Photograph, dated April 25, 2018
Exhibit no. I13	Video, dated April 25, 2018
Exhibit no. I14	Complaints, filed April 25, 2018
Exhibit no. I15	Voicemail from Nick Stephens, dated July 19, 2018
Exhibit no. I17	Photograph, dated September 18, 2018
Exhibit no. I18	Photograph, dated September 18, 2018
Exhibit no. I19	Video, dated September 19, 2018
Exhibit no. I20	Video, dated September 25, 2018
Exhibit no. I21	Photograph, dated October 2, 2018
Exhibit no. I22	Photograph, dated December 2, 2018
Exhibit no. I23	Photograph woodpile, dated December 7, 2018
Exhibit no. I24	Video, dated June 20, 2019
Exhibit no. I25	Photograph, dated July 17, 2019
Exhibit no. I26	Video, dated July 27, 2019
Exhibit no. I27	Photograph, dated September 7, 2019
Exhibit no. I28	Email to Council Member Joe McDermott
Exhibit no. I29	Photograph, dated November 19, 2019
Exhibit no. I30	Photograph, dated November 19, 2019
Exhibit no. I31	Photograph, dated November 27, 2019
Exhibit no. I32	Video, dated December 17, 2019
Exhibit no. I33	Video, dated January 20, 2020
Exhibit no. I34	Video, dated March 29, 2020
Exhibit no. I35	Photograph ravine edge, dated March 30, 2020
Exhibit no. I36	Video, dated October 29, 2020
Exhibit no. I37	Video, dated October 31, 2020
Exhibit no. I38	Photograph, dated December 17, 2020
Exhibit no. I39	Photograph, dated December 17, 2020
Exhibit no. I40	Video grinding, dated December 18, 2020
Exhibit no. I41	Video prep, dated December 22, 2020
Exhibit no. I42	Photograph grind, dated December 23, 2020
Exhibit no. I43	Video grinding, dated December 23, 2020

Exhibit no. I44	Photograph, dated December 23, 2020
Exhibit no. I45	Video, dated December 23, 2020
Exhibit no. I46	Photograph, dated December 26, 2020
Exhibit no. I47	Photograph, dated January 6, 2021
Exhibit no. I48	Video ravine work, dated January 18, 2021
Exhibit no. I49	Video posts, dated January 21, 2021
Exhibit no. I50	Photograph, dated January 21, 2021
Exhibit no. I51	Summary List of dates

DS/lo

August 3, 2021

**OFFICE OF THE HEARING EXAMINER  
KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON**

King County Courthouse  
516 Third Avenue Room 1200  
Seattle, Washington 98104  
Telephone (206) 477-0860  
[hearingexaminer@kingcounty.gov](mailto:hearingexaminer@kingcounty.gov)  
[www.kingcounty.gov/independent/hearing-examiner](http://www.kingcounty.gov/independent/hearing-examiner)

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

SUBJECT: Department of Local Services file nos. **ENFR180277 and SWO**

**DOUGLAS AND SUSAN HOFFMANN**  
Code Enforcement Appeal

I, Lauren Olson, certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that I transmitted the **REPORT AND DECISION** to those listed on the attached page as follows:

EMAILED to all County staff listed as parties/interested persons and parties with e-mail addresses on record.

placed with the United States Postal Service, with sufficient postage, as FIRST CLASS MAIL in an envelope addressed to the non-County employee parties/interested persons to addresses on record.

DATED August 3, 2021.



---

Lauren Olson  
Legislative Secretary

**Breazeal, Jeri**  
Department of Local Services

**Casey, Laura**

**Engelhard, Scott**  
Hardcopy

**Grace, Kerri**  
Hardcopy

**Hoffmann, Douglas/Susan**  
Hardcopy

**Lux, Sheryl**  
Department of Local Services

**Stephens, Nick**  
Department of Local Services

**Tuchak, Travis**  
Hardcopy