

BEFORE THE HEARING EXAMINER
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SNOHOMISH

In re Husaynia Islamic Society of
Seattle,

No. 20-114230 CUP

Husaynia Islamic Society of Seattle,

Order Denying Reconsideration of
Decision

Applicant.

1 **SUMMARY**

2 Petitioners¹ seek reconsideration of the Hearing Examiner’s decision of March 16, 2023,
3 approving a conditional use permit with conditions.² Petitioners complain that Hearing
4 Examiner erred regarding the size of the congregation, parking, sound, and drainage.
5 Petitioners failed to satisfy the legal requirements for reconsideration as explained below
6 and the petition is denied.

7 **RECONSIDERATION STANDARDS**

8 The purpose of reconsideration is **not** to re-argue the case or present arguments already
9 made. “A reconsideration motion should not merely present arguments previously raised . .
10 ..” *United States v. Westlands Water District*, 134 F. Supp. 2d 1111, 1130 (E.D. Cal. 2001)
11 (citation omitted). Petitioners only restate arguments previously made in their public
12 comments.

13 County code limits the grounds for reconsideration. Two of those grounds are cited by
14 Petitioners: (1) error of law and (2) findings, conclusions, or conditions are not supported by
15 the record. SCC 30.72.065 (2)(c), (d) (2013). Petitioners did not identify any errors of law,
16 though they repeatedly invoked the phrase. An error of law is an “error in applying the law to
17 the facts as pleaded and established.” *In re Jones’ Estate*, 116 Wash. 424, 426, 199 P. 734,

¹ Petitioners are parties of record Amy Amend, Mark Amend, Carter Burns, Mary Lou Burns, Shari Crichton, Kim Cutili, Steve Drew, Vanner Elander, Greg Gilbertson, Sean Herbert, Deanna Herbert, Robert Johnson, Laura Keegan, Ruth Laberge, Dale Muzzuco, and Deborah Wetzell.

² Ex. T.1. Petitioners attached a transcript of proceedings that they prepared. *Id.*, attachments A and B. An informal transcript prepared by the parties is not the official record or transcript or report of proceedings and the Hearing Examiner did not rely on it. Petitioners’ informal transcript is included in the record because it is an exhibit to the petition for reconsideration. Its inclusion in the record should not be misunderstood as review, approval, adoption, or settling of the informal transcript.

1 734 (1921), citing *Morgan v. Williams*, 77 Wash. 343, 137 Pac. 476 (1914).³ Petitioners only
2 offered conclusory statements that the decision erred as a matter of law, repeated
3 arguments already made in public comments, and did not identify any specific mistakes in
4 the application of the law to the facts. Petitioners disagree with findings, but do not identify
5 any findings unsupported by the record.

6 CONGREGATION SIZE

7 Petitioners' complaint regarding the congregation size is an example of such
8 disagreement.⁴

9 The Examiner committed an error of law in assigning a random number of
10 congregants of less than two-thirds of the actual building occupancy based
11 upon square footage. The maximum number of congregants should have
12 been set at 80 in the Conditions.

13 Petitioners' characterization of the finding of number of congregants as "random" is
14 inaccurate. The Hearing Examiner's finding that typical congregation attendance is
15 approximately 40 people, ranging up to 80 on holidays, is not random, but supported by the
16 record. Petitioners did not identify a misinterpretation or misapplication of any specific law.

17 PARKING AND TRAFFIC

18 Petitioners appear to contend that the mosque will create an inadequate road condition
19 (IRC).⁵ Petitioners misunderstand the character of an IRC. As defined by county code, an
20 IRC is not traffic congestion. "Inadequate road condition" refers to the characteristics of a
21 road location that "jeopardizes the safety of road users . . . as determined by the county
22 engineer." SCC 30.911.020 (2003).⁶ The county engineer has not determined that an IRC
23 exists or is likely to exist that will be affected by three or more directional trips.⁷ Petitioners
24 presented no evidence of a physical characteristic of any road that would jeopardize the

³ Examples of errors of law include constitutionality, jurisdiction, and interpretation and application of case law and legislation. See *Comptroller of Maryland v. FC-GEN Operations Investments LLC*, 482 Md. 343, 360, 287 A.3d 271, 281 (2022), as corrected.

⁴ Ex. T.1, 5:3-5.

⁵ Ex. T.1, pp. 7, 8, and 10.

⁶ The County Engineer uses a two-step process to determine whether a location on a road is an IRC. First, an IRC review board performs a technical evaluation consistent with Federal Highway Administration guidance documents. Second, the County Engineer reviews the board's recommendation. DPW Rule 4223.040 (2016). FHA guidance documents create a relative hazard index for a location based on the number of accidents per year, the accident rate at the location, the severity of the accidents, the volume/capacity ratio of the road, sight distances at the location, traffic conflicts, erratic maneuvers, driver expectancies, and information system deficiencies. 42 PUBLIC ROADS: A JOURNAL OF HIGHWAY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT 115 (December 1978). Traffic congestion is not a criterion. The Hearing Examiner takes official notice of publicly available and published records such as the rules of the department of Public Works, federal agency publications, and case law. H. Ex. R. of Proc. 5.6(i) (2021).

⁷ Ex. C.6, p.2.

1 safety of a user of the road, except the conclusory allegation that increased traffic equal
2 diminishes safety.

3 Petitioners appear to believe that 280 parking stalls should be required because the
4 applicant's traffic engineer opined that calculating parking demand based on the size of the
5 building resulted in an unreasonable number (280) and therefore used a different method to
6 determine parking demand.⁸

7 The parking demand based on the size of the building was determined to not
8 be a reasonable basis for the parking demand since the average peak-period
9 parking demand would result in a demand of 280 parking spaces. This
10 parking demand would represent more than 3 vehicles per attendee, which
11 does not represent a reasonable estimate of the parking demand.

12 Witnesses testified the average attendance at the mosque will be approximately 40
13 persons, increasing to 80 on holidays. Husaynia proposed parking stalls that PDS and the
14 Hearing Examiner find sufficient for holiday attendance. Petitioners made no attempt to
15 explain why 3 vehicles per attendee would be reasonable, or that 280 parking stalls would
16 be appropriate. Petitioners appear to argue that the traffic consultant's **rejection** of 280
17 parking stalls as appropriate somehow means that 280 parking stalls are needed. Requiring
18 280 parking stalls for typical attendance of 40 and holiday attendance of 80 would be
19 unreasonable. Mere disagreement with a finding or conclusion is insufficient grounds for
20 reconsideration.

21 Petitioners object to trip generation credit for the existing facility, apparently arguing that the
22 previous use of the facility for horse boarding was never a permitted use.⁹ The prior use of
23 the property has been characterized as a horse arena. This characterization determined the
24 credits for existing average daily trip generation. Petitioners contend that the use was not
25 permitted, that no credit for existing trips should be given, and that therefore the conditional
26 use permit must be denied.¹⁰ The latter point is incorrect. Even if the amount of the credit is

⁸ "The Examiner did not set an attendee limit, so the parking demand of 280 vehicles must be utilized and the Examiner committed an error of law by not doing so." Ex. T.1, 11:6-7/ Ex. C.1., PDF p. 10 (traffic impact analysis).

⁹ E.g., ex. T.1, 8:3-4.

¹⁰ Additionally, Petitioners appears to contend that a previous unpermitted use somehow disqualifies the current owner from seeking a conditional use permit for a religious worship facility. A religious worship facility is a use explicitly allowed by county code, albeit with conditions. Petitioners' objection therefore lacks merit. Petitioners also criticize Husaynia's intended renovation of the facility, expressing skepticism regarding the reasonableness and feasibility of the renovation, and questioning the safety of the structure. Converting the structure into the planned facility will require building permits based on compliance with current building codes, including life/safety codes. After renovation, the facility cannot be used as a religious worship facility unless and until the county inspects the facility for compliance with life/safety codes, e.g., fire code, and issues a certificate of occupancy. The certificate of occupancy will limit the number of people who can be in the facility based on the fire code. Petitioners' concerns are therefore not a basis for rejecting the conditional use permit.

1 wrong, it is not a basis for denying the conditional use permit, but would be a basis for
2 changing the condition regarding the amount of the road impact mitigation fee.¹¹

3 Petitioners complain that the decision did not provide sufficiently objective standards for
4 enforcement regarding parking¹² and that the decision allowed parking on State St.¹³ Both
5 contentions are wrong. Condition 11 explicitly addresses parking on State St.:

6 If on-site parking is inadequate and overflows to State St. more than three
7 times in any six-month period, Husaynia shall design, obtain relevant permits
8 for, and construct additional parking on the site to eliminate the overflow
9 parking on State St.

10 Petitioners also incorrectly stated the “Conditions failed to provide objective criteria that . . .
11 parking will comply with applicable zoning, critical area, etc. requirements.”¹⁴ Condition 11
12 explicitly requires Husaynia to obtain relevant permits, which permits cannot be issued
13 unless Husaynia complies with applicable regulations in effect at the time of an application
14 for the permit, e.g., critical areas.

15 **SOUND**

16 Petitioners disagree with adequacy of the sound evaluation provided by Husaynia and
17 disagrees with the Hearing Examiner’s findings and conclusions that standard construction
18 techniques will likely be adequate to prevent interior sound from exceeding code-defined
19 sound limits at the property’s boundaries.¹⁵ These arguments were made before, as
20 demonstrated by Petitioners’ reliance on its expert’s report. The Hearing Examiner’s
21 findings of fact are clearly supported by the record. Petitioners disagree, but disagreement
22 is not a legal basis for reconsideration.

23 **BUILDING STANDARDS**

24 Petitioners appear to believe that the conditional use permit must be denied if a new facility
25 must be built instead of remodeling or renovating the existing structure.¹⁶ That is not so,
26 however. A conditional use permit allows the property to be put to a particular **use**; it is not
27 a building permit or certificate of occupancy. The building, however, may affect the
28 conditions imposed on the use. For example, building size and external appearance relate

¹¹ 78.40 claimed existing trips x \$142.00 (TSA C mitigation rate/ADT) = \$11,076.

¹² “The Conditions failed to provide objective criteria that additional off-street parking . . .” Ex. T.1, p. 12.

¹³ “The Examiner has now placed a condition that the Applicant can use the new 8- foot-wide paved shoulder for overflow parking.” *Id.*, p. 13.

¹⁴ *Id.*, p.12.

¹⁵ *Id.*, pp. 6-7.

¹⁶ “This proposal is a major change to the property, and the Examiner committed an error of law in basing his findings on a project that clearly lacks the required information for an approval to be issued as will be addressed below.” Ex. T.1, 2:10-12.

1 to the facility's compatibility with the site and surrounding property. SCC 30.42C.100(4)
2 (2013). As represented, the building size and exterior will not materially change from its
3 current appearance, which is compatible with the site and surrounding properties.

4 Petitioners also claim the existing structure was not permitted,¹⁷ yet the record indicates the
5 structure was permitted and the permit finally inspected.¹⁸ Irrespective of whether the
6 existing structure received a building permit, a remodeled or new structure must comply
7 with the current building and fire code. A remodeled or new structure must receive a
8 certificate of occupancy that will not be issued unless and until the structure complies with
9 county codes, including the fire code and structural requirements imposed by the building
10 code. Petitioners imply the decision granting the conditional use permit excepts Husaynia
11 from compliance with the fire code and other building requirements.¹⁹ The decision only
12 permits a use, it does not except Husaynia from compliance with the fire and building
13 codes.

14 DRAINAGE

15 Petitioners contend, "The Examiner failed to consider the public submission addressing the
16 inadequacy of the proposed drainage and grading."²⁰ Petitioners do not explain further. The
17 Hearing Examiner considered public comments regarding drainage,²¹ as well as evidence
18 from subject matter experts at the county²² and those engaged by the applicant.²³ The
19 Hearing Examiner found Husaynia's proposed method of compliance with the drainage
20 manual to be feasible. PDS evaluates the adequacy of final engineered construction plans
21 when deciding whether to issue a land disturbing activity permit.

22 Petitioners do not allege any findings or conclusions related to drainage and critical areas
23 are not supported by the record. Petitioners may disagree with the findings and conclusions,
24 but the findings and conclusions are supported by credible evidence.

¹⁷ Ex. T.1, 2:17, citing ex. Q.18, p. 4, att. H.

¹⁸ Ex. Q.18, attachments H, I, J, K., L, and M.

¹⁹ "Nothing in the Applicant's submissions has addressed these crucial issues [of earthquake stabilization, fire suppression, emergency and safety exits] and there is no mention in the Decision addressing these safety issues. One cannot simply say, wait until there is a fire where over 200 adults and innocent children perish. Where is the concern for human life?" Ex. T.1, 3:7-13.

²⁰ Ex. T.1, 12 (footnote omitted).

²¹ *E.g.*, exhibits H.140 and H.151

²² Exhibits C.7 and C.8 and testimony of Erin Harker. The Hearing Examiner finds this evidence credible.

²³ Exhibits C.2, C.3, and C.4.

1 **CONCLUSION**

2 Petitioners failed to satisfy the requirements for reconsideration established in SCC
3 30.72.065 (2013). They disagree with the outcome, but disagreement is not sufficient legal
4 basis for reconsideration.

5 It is therefore ORDERED that the petition for reconsideration be and hereby is denied.²⁴

6 DATED this 17th day of April, 2023.

7 Peter B. Camp

8 Peter B. Camp

9 Snohomish County Hearing Examiner

10 **RECONSIDERATION AND APPEAL**

11 **1. RECONSIDERATION**

12 Further motions for reconsideration will not be considered because county code allows only
13 one motion for reconsideration. SCC 30.72.065(5) (2013).

14 **2. APPEAL**

15 An appeal to the County Council may be filed by any aggrieved party of record **on or**
16 **before May 1, 2023**. Where the reconsideration process of SCC 30.72.065 has been
17 invoked, no appeal may be filed until the reconsideration petition has been decided by the
18 hearing examiner. An aggrieved party need not file a petition for reconsideration but may file
19 an appeal directly to the County Council. If a petition for reconsideration is filed, issues
20 subsequently raised by that party on appeal to the County Council shall be limited to those
21 issues raised in the petition for reconsideration.

22 **Filing**

23 Appeals shall be addressed to the Snohomish County Council but shall be filed in writing
24 with the Department of Planning and Development Services, 2nd Floor, County
25 Administration-East Building, 3000 Rockefeller Avenue, Everett, Washington (Mailing
26 address: M/S No. 604, 3000 Rockefeller Avenue, Everett, WA 98201), and shall be
27 accompanied by a filing fee in the amount of five hundred dollars (\$500.00) for each appeal
28 filed; PROVIDED, that the fee shall not be charged to a department of the County. The filing

²⁴ SCC 30.72.065(4)(a) (2013).
In Re Husaynia Islamic Society of Seattle
20-114230 CUP
Order Denying Reconsideration of Decision
Page 6 of 7

1 fee shall be refunded in any case where an appeal is summarily dismissed in whole without
2 hearing under SCC 30.72.075.

- 3 1. Scan the original manually signed (handwritten) copy of the appeal document;
- 4 2. Send your appeal as an email attachment to epermittech@snoco.org. Please include
5 your phone number where you can be reliably reached.
- 6 3. Staff will call you to collect your credit card information and process your payment.
- 7 4. Mail the original to Snohomish County PDS, 3000 Rockefeller M/S 604, Everett, WA
8 98201.

9 Contents

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

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

- 19 (a) The decision exceeded the Hearing Examiner's jurisdiction;
- 20 (b) The Hearing Examiner failed to follow the applicable procedure in reaching his
21 decision;
- 22 (c) The Hearing Examiner committed an error of law; or
- 23 (d) The Hearing Examiner's findings, conclusions and/or conditions are not supported
24 by substantial evidence in the record. SCC 30.72.080

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

28 Staff Distribution:

29 Department of Planning and Development Services: Haleh Ghazanfarpour

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

Organization	Name	Address	City	State	Zip	Email
POR/AGENCY REGISTER	20-114230-CUP HUSAYNIA ISLAMIC SOCIETY OF SEATTLE	HEARING: OCTOBER 13, 2022 AT 1:00 PM				
APPLICANT/OWNER						
HUSAYNIA ISLAMIC SOCIETY OF SEATTLE	ZAHRA ABDI MASOOD ZAIDI	15231 STATE STREET	SNOHOMISH	WA	98296	zehranabidi@hotmail.com masood_z@hotmail.com
CONTACT PERSON						
AMKONA CONSULTING, LLC KIMLEY-HORN	ONUM ESONU EDWARD KOLTONOWSKI	2519 150TH PLACE SW	LYNNWOOD	WA	98087	amkona1@comcast.net edward.koltonowski@kimley-horn.com
AGENCIES						
	LORI BURKE KEN CROSSMAN ERIN HARKER DAVID IRWIN					lori.burke@snoco.org Ken.Crossman@co.snohomish.wa.us Erin.harker@snoco.org david.irwin@snoco.org
SNO CO PLAN & DEV/LAND USE CROSS VALLEY WATER DISTRICT SNO CO DEPT OF PUBLIC WORKS SNOHOMISH HEALTH DISTRICT SNOQUALMIE INDIAN TRIBE	HALEH GHAZANFARPOUR MICHAEL JOHNSON DOUG MCCORMICK AMY KUNTZ ANN HARRIE - ATTORNEY MICHAEL DOBESH	3000 ROCKEFELLER AVE #604 8802 189TH ST SE 3000 ROCKEFELLER AVE #607 3020 RUCKER AVE SUITE #104 PO BOX 969	EVERETT SNOHOMISH EVERETT EVERETT SNOQUALMIE	WA WA WA WA WA	98201 98296 98201 98201 98065	Haleh.Ghazanfarpour@snoco.org cwvd@crossvalleywater.net dmccormick@co.snohomish.wa.us EnvHlthQuestions@snohd.org ann.harrie@snoqualmietribe.us michael.dobesh@snoco.org
PARTIES OF RECORD						
	AMANDA PARRIS AZAD CATHLEEN GUSTAFSON KATRINA STEWART JIM TURNER DARLENE MILLER-TURNER DAVE CHEN ANDERS LABERGE CHRIS LABERGE CHRIS & RUTH LABERGE CARTER & MARY LOU BURNS LAUREL ELANDER VANER E. ELANDER CARTER BURNS TYLER AND BENJAMIN OOSTRA STEVE DREW WILLEIKSEN JANA KHAN RIAZ SYED MASROOR SYED WAQAR KAZIN ALI MUHAMMAD	9627 152ND ST SE 9627 152ND ST SE	SNOHOMISH SNOHOMISH	WA WA	98296 98296	aazad@cair.com cathgust@hotmail.com tstewart@nsuch.com jaturnd@comcast.net
						rental5710@yahoo.com requested removal 3/27/23
						chrislaberge@outlook.com Ruthmarie310@outlook.com mlb_1943@yahoo.com lollybupp@hotmail.com van@elandervil.us cbandml@yahoo.com tyoosttra@gmail.com sdrew@precisetoolco.com Jana.jessen@Providence.org
Added 10/5/2022						
		9305 156TH STREET SE 16011 95TH AVE SE 9716 152ND ST SE 9631 152nd st se	SNOHOMISH SNOHOMISH SNOHOMISH SNOHOMISH	WA WA WA WA	98296 98296 98296 98296	
		4767 ARBORS CIR 23226 24TH AVE SE 18765 76th Ave W 25301 19th PL SE	MUKILTEO BOTHHELL LYNNWOOD EVERETT	WA WA WA WA	98275 98021 98037 98208	US MAIL US MAIL US MAIL US MAIL
COUNCIL ON AMERICAN ISLAMIC RELATIONS IN WASHINGTON STATE	AHMED BAYA AARBI SAHARYAR AFZALI, ANEELAH AISHA AKBAR BATOOL AMEND AMY AMEND MARK ANDERSON JESSAMINE AUJ MASROOR & SHUMALA, AKBAR & ALI EZZA ARAMBURU RICHARD BAILY DEBRA	17550 NE 67th Ct #207	REDMOND	WA	98052	adgaya@gmail.com aarbi2@yahoo.com info@mapsredmond.org aishas.786@gmail.com bhakbar@costco.com amy.amend@gmail.com mark.amend@gmail.com jessaminea@gmail.com Syed.Hussain@microsoft.com rick@aramburulaw.com
		9131 152ND ST SE	SNOHOMISH	WA	98296	US MAIL

THE EPISCOPAL DIOCESE OF OLYMPIA	BAILY SHAWN BALDEH MUSA BASIOR DAVID RABBI BAUMUELLER HAROLD	15220 91ST AVE SE	SNOHOMISH	WA	98296	shawnbaily@aol.com baldehmose@gmail.com rabbidavid@kadima.org harley.house@frontier.com	
FAITH ACTION NETWORK	BEECHER JOSEFINA REV. BENJAMIN OOSTRA Elise DeGooyer BILLA IRENE BOLGER LARA PASTOR BRADLEY (us), BRAD F BUPP SHERRY BUTLER CAROL CAGUIAT CARLOS REV. CAGUIAT JULIANNA rev. CASEY ANN CHARVET JAMES CLIFFORD MICHAEL REV. CAROL COHOE COLES MARGIE CONKLIN CARI CONLEY-HOLCOM ANDREW PASTOR CRICHTON SHARI CRISPIN BETH CUTULI KIM D ERICKA DALY BRANNON DAVIS JONIS DERR TERI DREW STEVE DUBEY ICHA DURRENTT ERIN EBNER PATTY REV. EENWYK JOHN REV. DR. ENGL KYLEY & CARRIE ENGL KYLEY & CARRIE FICKLIN BETSY FINE DAVID RABBI FONG TINA FOSTER KIMBERLY FRODSHAM TOM GARDNER ROBERT & THEA GAYA AHMED GILBERT DE VARGUS SALLY JO GILBERTSON ELENA GILBERTSON GREG HACKING TROY HARGER DEL & CAROL	9732 156th ST SE	SNOHOMISH	WA	98296	revjosefina@hotmail.com benjamin.oostra@gmail.com degooyer@fanwa.org ibilla@yahoo.com pastor@redmondumc.org brad.f.bradley@boeing.com sherry_bupp@outlook.com caroldance@frontier.com carlos.caguiat58@gmail.com caguiatjulianna10@gmail.com ann.casey@gmail.com jscharvet@comcast.net	undeliverable
FAITH ACTION NETWORK	CONLEY-HOLCOM ANDREW PASTOR CRICHTON SHARI CRISPIN BETH CUTULI KIM D ERICKA DALY BRANNON DAVIS JONIS DERR TERI DREW STEVE DUBEY ICHA DURRENTT ERIN EBNER PATTY REV. EENWYK JOHN REV. DR. ENGL KYLEY & CARRIE ENGL KYLEY & CARRIE FICKLIN BETSY FINE DAVID RABBI FONG TINA FOSTER KIMBERLY FRODSHAM TOM GARDNER ROBERT & THEA GAYA AHMED GILBERT DE VARGUS SALLY JO GILBERTSON ELENA GILBERTSON GREG HACKING TROY HARGER DEL & CAROL	4320 SW HILL ST 14529 BROADWAY AVE	SEATTLE SNOHOMISH	WA WA	98116 98296	pastorandrew@admiralchurch.org shari.crichton@gmail.com	requested removal 1/31/23
NORTHLAKE LUTHERAN CHRUCH	FOSTER KIMBERLY FRODSHAM TOM GARDNER ROBERT & THEA GAYA AHMED GILBERT DE VARGUS SALLY JO GILBERTSON ELENA GILBERTSON GREG HACKING TROY HARGER DEL & CAROL	9921 151ST PL SE	SNOHOMISH	WA	98296	kcutuli@comcast.net ezy.e5420@yahoo.com Brannon.Daly@cochraninc.com jonisdavis@gmail.com teriderrings@gmail.com sdrew@precisetoolco.com	undeliverable requested removal from list 11/14/22
SNOQUALMIE UNITED METHODIST	HARGER DEL & CAROL CARRIE BLAND HASSAN SYED HELMON ANJA HERBERT DEANNA HERBERT SEAN HOWELL ANTHONY & TRACEY	15603 BROADWAY AVE	SNOHOMISH	WA	98296	patty@fccbellevue.org jrv@uw.edu kandcengle@gmail.com teor72@gmail.com bticklin@frontier.com david.jb.fine@gmail.com tinalfong@gmail.com kim8911@hotmail.com tomfrodsham@yahoo.com trgardner.2@gmail.com	requested removal 2/23/23
NORTHLAKE LUTHERAN CHRUCH	HERBERT DEANNA HERBERT SEAN HOWELL ANTHONY & TRACEY	9663 152ND STREET SE 9323 152NE ST SE	SNOHOMISH SNOHOMISH	WA WA	98296 98296	carolharger2005@yahoo.com sallyjogilbert@gmail.com ggandeg@outlook.com ggilbertson@cochraninc.com troy.hacking@gmail.com d13carter@gmail.com sean.smhbuxton@gmail.com duramax9323@gmail.com	requested removal 3/27/23 undeliverable undeliverable

	HUSAIN KHAN MEHDI	19821 23RD DRIVE SE	BOTHELL	WA	98012	mehdihusain@yahoo.com	
	HUSSAIN SYED					syedc@yahoo.com	
	IQBAL AWAIS					Awais.Iqbal@microsoft.com	
	JAFFE RHONDA	9605-156TH ST SE	SNOHOMISH	WA	98296	michaelnrhonda@msn.com	
	JAFREY OWAIS					jafreyomi@gmail.com	
WINDERMERE KIRKLAND NE	JARVIE SAMANTHA	11411 NE 124TH ST SUITE 110	KIRKLAND	WA	98034	samjarvie@windermere.com	
	JOHNSON BOB	15405 STATE STREET	SNOHOMISH	WA	98296	bobjohnsonwoodworking@gmail.com	
	JOHNSON DAVID AND TERI	15203 STATE ST	SNOHOMISH	WA	98296	daveterijo@comcast.net	
	JUDD JOHN					john.judd@comcast.net	
	JUMAAN AISHA					aishaoj@gmail.com	
	KARIM MUBARRA					mubarra@outlook.com	
	KAZMI MUTAHIR	3519 164TH St SE	BOTHELL	WA	98012	kazmi.mutahir@gmail.com	
	KEEGAN LAURA					joeandlaurakeega@earthlink.net	
	KHAKI NEELAM					neelam@apichaya.org	
	KHALID ADNAN					mr.adnankhalid@gmail.com	
	KHAN JUWARIYA					juwariyakhan@hotmail.com	
	KING ROBERT					robert@nwqrd.com	
EDMONDS UNITARIAN UNIVERSALIST CONGREGATION	KINGMAN CELIA REV.						requested removal from list 9/2/22
	KLUTH PAM					kluthgl1969@gmail.com	
SNOHOMISH UNITED METHODIST CHURCH	KURTZ JANELLE REV.					pastorsnohomishumc@gmail.com	
	LABERGE RUTHMARIE					Ruthmarie310@outlook.com	
	LARKIN SHERRI	9804 WAVERLY DR	SNOHOMISH	WA	98296	gslarkin@gmail.com	
	LAYTNER ANSON					laytner@msn.com	
	LEVINE RAE					rlevine@igc.org	
FIRST PREBYTERIAN CHURCH OF SNOHOMISH	LEWIS CHARLIE					charlie@snopres.org	
	LITORIA FRAN FEILDEN AND MARVE	9511 148TH ST SE	SNOHOMISH	WA	98296	franniex9@aol.com	
	LUBRESKY ANDY	15211 91ST AVE SE	SNOHOMISH	WA	98296	lubreskyandy@yahoo.com	
	LXXX FARAH					kiz_14_5@yahoo.com	
COALITION OF SEATTLE INDIAN AMERICANS	LYER KANTHI					seattleindians@gmail.com	
	MOHMOOD HAMID						requested removal 3/28/23
	MAHMUD RUSDIANTO					rusdiantomahmud@yahoo.com	
	MAKARY MAX					maxmakary@gmail.com	
DAI BAI ZAN CHO BO ZEN JI	MARINELLO GENJO REV. , ABBOTT					zenquake@gmail.com	
	MARSHALL LAUREN						requested removal 10/31/22
	MCMANUS KELLY	15207 STATE STREET	SNOHOMISH	WA	98296	kam907@gmail.com	
	MOHAMMAD AHMAR					ahmarm@hotmail.com	
	MOODY MECHELE					brianb800@yahoo.com	
	MUZZUCO DALE					dale@muzzuco.com	
	MUZZUCO TERESA					teresa@muzzuco.com	
	NELSON TERESA					bellever@aol.com	
	NORDHOLM GAYLE					gayle@otnpro.com	
	DEBBIE OGLESBY					debbieoglesby@hotmail.com	
	OLSON PATTI					patti.olsen062@gmail.com	
	OWENS SARAH					sarahmattowens@gmail.com	
	PERRIGO RAVEN					kalypsoe@hotmail.com	
	PETRIE BRAD					petrie.bc@comcast.net	
SEATTLE FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH	PHILLIPS TIM	1111 HARVARD AVENUE	SEATTLE	WA	98122	tim@seattlefirstbaptist.org	
	PORCELLO KALYN					porcello1964@gmail.com	
	PRICE GLORIA	16116 MARKET ST	SNOHOMISH	WA	98296	ecirpjj@yahoo.com	
	PURCER STEVEN						requested removal 3/28/23
CHURCH COUNCIL OF GREATER SEATTLE	RAMOS MICHAEL					mramos@thechurchcouncil.org	
	ROBERTS JAN					janniesept27@gmail.com	
ST JOHNS EPISCOPAL CHURCH	ROSARIO-CRUZ ELIACIN REV.					office@stjohnsnohomish.org	

SAINT MARK'S EPISCOPAL CATHEDRAL	ROSEBERRY VALERIE						val.roseberry@gmail.com	
	ROSS NANCY REV CANON/ERIK ROSS	1245 10TH AVE E	SEATTLE	WA	98102			requested removal 2/23/23
	RYGH MARDELLE	9219 152ND ST SE	SNOHOMISH	WA	98296			US MAIL
	SALMAN MUSA						musa.salman2005@icloud.com	
	SAMAD RIZWAN						riz@newwavetravel.com	
	SANWIK PATRICIA	1306 ALKE VIEW AVE	SNOHOMISH	WA	98290		steffpatsanvik@comcast.net	
FOUNDER & CEO MUSLIM COMMUNITY RESOURCE CENTER (MCRC)	SHAHARYAR KIRAN						kiran.shaharyar@gmail.com	
	SHERIFF NICKHATH						amnicksath@yahoo.com	
	SHIELDS ANN MARIE	15730 STATE STREET	SNOHOMISH	WA	98296		annmariegreys@gmail.com	
	SIAL AISHA	864 VILLAGE WAY, APT. 214	MONROE	WA	98272		aishasial65@gmail.com	
MADISON PARTNERS REAL ESTATE	SIDDIQUI JEFF						jeffsiddiqui@msn.com	
	SIDDIQUI IMRAN						imraan.siddiqi@gmail.com	
	SMITH BRANDON						brandonjsmith122@gmail.com	
	SPARKS SUSAN	15206 HIGH BRIDGE ROAD	MONROE	WA	98272			requested removal 2/23/23
	SYED RIZWAN	16519 27TH DR SE	BOTHELL	WA	98012		syedrizzwanm@yahoo.com	
	SNYDER JAMES						snyderjms@comcast.net	
ST JOHNS EPISCOPAL CHURCH	TABER-HAMILTON NIGEL						rectorhome@whidbey.com	
	TACH WILLIAM						wthach@comcast.net	
	UNTENER JENNIE						jennieuntener@hotmail.com	
INDIA ASSOCIATION OF WESTERN WASHINGTON	UPPALA LALITA						lujab@hotmail.com	
	UYYEK CHRISTINE						cuyyek@gmail.com	
	VANCE LAURIN VANCE PR						prlgvance@gmail.com	
	WALKER MAGGIE	15708 STATE STREET	SNOHOMISH	WA	98296		maggiewalker32@gmail.com	
	WALTON-HOUSE NANCY						N_WaltonHouse@msn.com	
	WARSAME UBAH							requested removal 2/23/23
NORTHWEST WASHINGTON SYNOD, ELCA	WEE SHELLEY BRYAN, BISHOP	5519 Phinney Ave N	Seattle	WA	98103		bishop@lutheransnw.org	
	WEISMAN JOSH, RABBI						joshweisman@gmail.com	
	WENTZEL ROGER	15727 91ST AVENUE S.E.	SNOHOMISH	WA	98296		roger_wentzel@yahoo.com	
SNOHOMISH TRIBUNE	WHITNEY MICHAEL						michael@snoho.com	
	WILLEIKSEN DAVE						dvilleiksen@hotmail.com	
	WILSON DRAKE						drakewilson2020@u.northwestern.edu	
	WETZEL DEBBIE						debbieleewetzel@gmail.com	
	WYATT JENNIFER						jenniferwyatt23@gmail.com	
BETHANY UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST	REV ANGELA YING						angelaying@bethanyseattle.org	
	ZAFAR SOHAIL						sohail30@gmail.com	
	ZAINVI ARBIA						arbia.zainvi@gmail.com	