



STAFF REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION TO THE HEARING EXAMINER

Report Date: February 6, 2026
Report Submitted By: Preston Pinkston, Planner
File Number: WCF25-0002
Project Name: Verizon Wireless – Harmoni Towers new cell tower construction
Scheduled Hearing Date: March 13, 2026

A. SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTION

Verizon Wireless proposes to construct a new 150 foot monopole tower with attached antennas and cabling along with ground mounted equipment cabinets placed within a 50x50 foot fenced area. The facility will be served by a 20 foot wide access road and utility connections.

B. GENERAL INFORMATION

Property Owner:	Kevin Riffle 8025 124 th Ave NE Kirkland, WA 98033
Applicant:	Harmoni Towers Bill North – North Group PO Box 2449 Snohomish, WA 98291
Tax Parcel Number:	028513011000
Location:	262 Skyview Dr
Square Footage/Acreage:	.06 acres (2,500 square feet) – lease area
Zoning Classification:	Rural Development District – 1 Residence per 5 acres (RDD-5)
Comp. Plan Designation:	Rural
Sewage Disposal:	none required for facility
Water Supply:	none required for facility

C. HISTORY/BACKGROUND

The wireless communication facility application (Staff Exhibit 1) was submitted on July 18, 2025 and determined to be complete on August 11, 2025 (Staff Exhibit 2). A Planning Review (MSR25-0118) for critical area and resource lands was conditionally approved for the wireless communication facility application on April 9, 2025 (Staff Exhibit 3). The inter-department review was conducted as part of the SEPA comment period on August 26, 2025 and three department comments were received (Staff Exhibit 4). Forty-two (42) public comments were submitted (Staff Exhibit 5).

D. PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE

A notice of public hearing is required to be issued 15 days prior to the Public Hearing per Lewis County Code (LCC) 17.05.040(2) Table 17.05-1. Staff intent is to notice the hearing 30 days prior to the hearing date. The hearing is scheduled for March 13, 2026. This staff report is being filed in advance of the public hearing notice, based on the special date settings of the Hearing Examiner.

E. AGENCIES CONTACTED

Lewis County Public Works Department
Lewis County Building Division
Washington State Department of Transportation
Washington State Department of Fish & Wildlife
Washington State Department of Ecology
Washington State Department of Natural Resources
Washington State Department of Archeology and Historic Preservation
Cowlitz Indian Tribe
Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis
US Army Corps of Engineers

F. NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

Topography:

The proposed 50x50 foot lease area is basically flat. There are some steep slopes located on the parcel, but they are located outside of the project area. The project area is located on an erosion hazard area. A Geotechnical Report will be provided with the Building Permits as a condition of approval of MSR25-0118.

Wildlife:

Even though the parcel is not located within a mapped habitat area, the project was reviewed by Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) during the SEPA review process. No comments or recommendations were received.

Other Sensitive Areas:

No other critical areas are mapped on the property or project area.

G. NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTERISTICS

The parcel is located within the Rural Development District (RDD-5) land use zone. The parcel is surrounded by RDD-5 zoning. The surrounding lots are mostly 5 acres with uses consistent with LCC 17.42.020 Table 2: Land Use Summary (Staff Exhibit 6). Access to the parcel is from Skyview Drive which is a private road connected to Birley Road.

H. STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (SEPA)

A SEPA Threshold Determination was issued on August 21, 2025 for the proposed wireless communication facility (Staff Exhibit 7). Forty-two comment letters were received (Staff Exhibit 5). The Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) was appealed (Staff Exhibit 8). The appeal was dismissed on November 18, 2025 (Staff Exhibit 9). The DNS remained in effect.

I. PUBLIC CONCERNS

As previously mentioned in the report, forty-two public comments were received on the notice of SEPA determination. Comments applicable to and directly related to the development standards included concerns about location and land use compatibility, visual impacts, environmental impacts, access including emergency services, and noise. These concerns are addressed below. All comments received are in Staff Exhibit 5.

J. STATUTES/CODES/FINDINGS

Wireless Communication Facilities are allowed in any land use zone, pursuant to the requirements of Lewis County Code (LCC) Chapter 15.50. The hearing examiner's decision shall be based upon compliance with the applicable development standards in LCC 15.50.030, the applicable design standards pursuant to LCC 15.50.035 and criteria for approving the permit as identified in LCC 15.50.040.

LCC Section 15.50.030:

(1) Collocation.

(a) The county shall deny an application for a new support tower if the applicant does not demonstrate a good faith effort to collocate on an existing facility. Applicants for new support towers shall demonstrate to the planning director that collocation is not feasible by showing that at least one of the following conditions exists:

(i) No existing towers or structures are located within the applicant's projected or planned service area for their facility; or

(ii) Existing towers or structures do not meet minimum structural specifications or cannot be reconfigured to achieve sufficient height for efficient and effective operations; or

(iii) Collocation would cause a nonconformance situation (e.g., exceeding height restrictions); or

(iv) Collocation would result in electronic, electromagnetic or other radio frequency interference with existing or proposed installations; or

(v) A reasonable financial arrangement between the applicant and the owner(s) of existing facilities could not be reached.

Staff Response:

The applicant states in the application packet that there were no collocation or support structure opportunities within the geographical area that met the coverage objectives. Analysis in support was submitted with application and is addressed later in the staff report.

(b) Carriers who collocate on existing towers or structures shall be allowed to construct or install accessory equipment and shelters as required for facility operation. Such development shall be subject to regulations under the International Building Code (IBC), applicable development standards of the underlying zone, and applicable development standards pursuant to this chapter (e.g., lighting, security, and signage).

Staff Response:

This criterion is not applicable. The applicant is proposing a new tower.

(c) All new support towers allowed under this chapter shall be designed for, and the owner shall not deny, collocation of public safety communications equipment at fair market value or other cost agreed by the parties in order to mitigate wireless communication interference with public safety communications.

Staff Response:

The applicant has indicated they will comply with this requirement (Staff Exhibit 1).

(2) New Support Towers. The following standards shall apply to new support towers:

(a) All new support towers shall accommodate collocation opportunities for a minimum total of two antenna arrays. A height bonus of up to 20 percent of the maximum tower height allowed in LCC 15.50.060(A)(2)(a) is allowed with one or more additionally proposed antenna arrays if the screening requirements of LCC 15.50.060(A)(2)(b) are met. **{NOTE: THIS IS AN INCORRECT CODE CITATION IN THE COUNTY CODE. THE CORRECT CODE CITATION SHOULD BE LCC 15.50.035(1)(c)}**

Staff Response:

The application packet states that the facility is designed for an additional three co-locators. This criterion has been met.

(b) A support tower owner approved under this chapter shall not deny a wireless provider the ability to collocate on their facility at a fair market rate or at another cost basis agreed to by the affected parties.

Staff Response:

As previously stated, the facility is designed for a total of four service providers. The applicant states that Harmoni Towers intends to market the facility to other providers in compliance with this section. This criterion has been met.

(c) New support tower installations shall be a minimum of 1,000 feet from designated scenic highways located outside of incorporated areas within the county.

Staff Response:

The proposed facility is more than 1,000 feet from US Highway 12, the nearest scenic highway. This criterion has been met.

(d) New support towers shall be a minimum of 1,000 feet from all sites listed on the National Register of Historic Places;

Staff Response:

There are no historic places within 1,000 feet of the proposed facility. This criterion has been met.

(e) New support towers within a 1,000 feet of a priority habitat or endangered/threatened species area shall be reviewed for possible impacts to fish and wildlife.

Staff Response:

The proposed facility is not located within 1,000 feet of a priority habitat. The application was sent to the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife during the SEPA comment period, no comments were provided. This criterion has been met.

(f) New support towers within one mile of any public safety building such as a police or fire station shall be reviewed with Lewis County Emergency Services and Emergency Management for possible interference with public safety communications.

Staff Response:

The proposed facility is not located within one mile of a public safety building. The applicant states in the application that the site would comply with any requirements from Lewis County Emergency Services and Emergency Management. No comments were submitted. This criterion has been met.

(g) Final site plan approval for support towers shall not be issued to infrastructure providers until one or more wireless communications service providers that are to use the support tower have been identified to the county.

Staff Response:

Verizon is the identified wireless communication service provider for this proposed tower. This criterion has been met.

(3) Utility pole placement/replacement. Placement of antennas or antenna arrays on existing structures such as utility poles, light standards, and light poles for street and parking lots shall be encouraged. Utility pole replacement proposals shall not be considered new support towers, and parcel size, setback, landscaping, and screening requirements of this chapter shall not apply. Utility pole replacements are subject to the following:

(a) The existing structure may be replaced with a similar diameter pole not exceeding 15 additional feet in height. Such increase in height shall only be allowed for the first replacement on the pole.

(b) The pole extension may not exceed the diameter of the pole at the mounting point for the antennas.

(c) For placement or replacement in the public rights-of-way, auxiliary support equipment shall be mounted on the pole or placed underground. No at-grade support equipment is permitted within the public right-of-way.

(d) Replacements in public rights-of-way are specifically subject to the applicable provisions of Chapter [12.20](#) LCC (Utilities Installations Within Rights-of-Way.), and Chapters [12.40](#) and [12.45](#) LCC (Telecommunications).

Staff Response:

This criterion is not applicable. The applicant is proposing a new tower.

(4) Signage. Wireless communication towers and antenna(s) shall not be used for signage, symbols, flags, banners, nor other devices or objects attached to, designed into or painted on any portion of a WCF except: emergency information, public safety warnings, and any additional signage required by a governmental agency shall be displayed in an appropriate manner.

Staff Response:

There is not any proposal to include signage on the wireless communication facility. However, in Staff Exhibit 1 the applicant indicates the owner will comply with the requirements. This criterion has been met.

(5) Noise. Wireless communication facilities shall not generate noise levels in excess of maximum standards set forth in Chapter [173-60](#) WAC. Generators may be operated only for emergency operation purposes. If air conditioning or other noise generating equipment is proposed, the applicant shall provide information detailing the expected noise level and any proposed mitigation measures. This may require noise attenuation devices or other technical or physical measures to minimize noise levels.

Staff Response:

The applicant did not directly address noise in the application but has indicated repeatedly in its submittal that the facility will comply with all local, state and federal requirements. The applicant states in the SEPA Checklist (Staff Exhibit 7) that minimal noise will be generated by the facility when fully operational.

LCC Section 15.50.035:

(1) Height. The following height restrictions for new WCFs shall apply:

(a) Support Structures. Attached WCFs shall not add more than 15 feet in height to the support structure (including utility pole replacements) to which they are attached.

(b) New Support Towers. New support tower heights are limited to the following:

(i) In rural areas the maximum height shall be 150 feet.

(ii) In urban nonresidential and non-school zone areas the maximum height shall be 120 feet.

(iii) In urban residential and school zone areas the maximum height shall be 85 feet.

(iv) In all areas, antennas or antenna arrays shall not add more than 15 feet in height to the support tower to which they are attached.

(c) Tower height may be increased as a height bonus of up to 20 percent if 80 percent of the total tower height is screened; provided, however, that vegetation which causes interference with antennae may be trimmed without loss of the height bonus.

Staff Response:

The proposal is located in a rural area with a tower height of 150 feet. These criteria have been met.

(2) Setbacks.

(a) All new support towers in rural areas shall maintain a minimum 50-foot setback from the property line of the parent parcel or a distance equal to or greater than the tower height from the nearest residence or school facility on adjacent parcels, whichever is greater.

(b) All new support towers in urban areas shall maintain a setback equal to or greater than the tower height from the nearest residence or school facility on adjacent parcels.

(c) Setbacks for auxiliary structures shall be those of the underlying zoning district or a minimum of 25 feet, whichever is greater.

Staff Response:

As stated in the application and conditionally approved Master Site Review, the proposal exceeds the minimum setback requirements to all property lines. The proposed tower is in a rural area with a minimum 50-foot setback. The nearest property line is 147' from the tower and is even further from the nearest residence. As proposed these criteria have been met.

(3) Landscaping and Screening.

(a) A landscaping and screening plan, as applicable, shall be submitted with all new support tower applications.

Staff Response:

Lewis County Staff did not require a landscaping and screening plan. The existing vegetation on site provides adequate screening for the tower. The applicant states in the application that the facility will be surrounded by a site obscuring fence which will screen the equipment from view. Existing trees and vegetation on site will be retained to provide additional natural landscaping and screening. The application included photo simulations of the tower using existing vegetation as screening. The applicant reiterated again in response to comments (Staff Exhibit 10) that the facility

would be screened to the maximum extent practicable with the existing vegetation. As proposed these criteria have been met.

(b) Screening. For new towers within 1,000 feet of scenic highways, sites listed on the National Register of Historic Places, a priority habitat or endangered/threatened species area, or urban residential and school zone areas, the following shall be required:

(i) Screening of new towers with tower-obscuring vegetation or with existing structures or topography is preferred.

(ii) If subsection (3)(b)(i) of this section cannot be reasonably complied with, new support towers shall be screened with vegetation appropriate to the site. Such vegetation shall consist of native tree species which will reach a height of 30 feet or more (and having a plant-maturity of six years at the time of transplanting to the site) and be substantially opaque year-round. The screening shall be permanently maintained.

Staff Response:

The new tower is not within 1,000 feet of a scenic highway, historic site, priority habitat, urban residential or school zone. These criteria do not apply.

(c) All new support towers and associated structures shall be fully enclosed within a minimum six-foot high security fence, at all times gated and locked; except, that fencing and buffering are not required on any site side where fencing can intersect an existing structure, which is the functional equivalent to fencing and buffering for access-control and minimum height. For new towers within 1,000 feet of scenic highways, sites listed on the National Register of Historic Places, a priority habitat or endangered/threatened species area, or urban residential and school zone areas, a minimum five-foot landscape, vegetative buffer shall be established surrounding the enclosure; except, that a landscaped berm may be substituted for the required vegetation buffer. The required landscaping shall be permanently maintained.

Staff Response:

The applicant states in the application that the facility will be surrounded by a site obscuring fence which will screen the equipment from view. As previously stated, the proposal is compliant with the screening requirements in LCC. These criteria have been met.

(4) Color. For all new wireless communications facilities, the following criteria shall apply:

(a) Unless otherwise required by the FAA, all support towers and antennas shall have a nonglare finish and blend with the natural background.

(b) Attached WCF's shall be of a neutral color that matches the color of the supporting structure to the greatest extent to minimize visual impacts.

Staff Response:

The application materials indicate the proposed facility will be painted with a non-glare finish and blend with the natural background. In the response to comments, the applicant states that the facility is a single monopole with a non-reflective finish and minimal profile. These design criteria have been met.

(5) Lighting. Except as required by the FAA, artificial lighting of wireless communications towers shall be prohibited. When allowed under FAA regulations, white strobe lighting of wireless communications towers shall be timed or photocell-controlled to operate only during daylight conditions; red strobe lighting is permissible at all times. Security lighting for equipment shelters or cabinets and other on-the-ground auxiliary equipment is allowed, as long as lighting utilizes "cut-off" type fixtures and is down-shielded to keep direct light within the site boundaries.

Staff Response:

The application materials (Staff Exhibit 1) indicate the tower will not be lit and is not required to be lit under FAA regulations. Any security lighting shall utilize "cut-off" type fixtures and will be down-shielded to keep direct light within the site boundaries. As conditioned, this design criteria has been met.

(6) Variances. Any applicant may request a variance under the design standards of this chapter. Requests for variance shall be made in writing to the Lewis County hearing examiner in accordance with the procedures and criteria specified in the LCC [17.160.040](#) (Variances). Appeal may be taken in accordance with LCC [15.50.040](#)(3). The applicant shall demonstrate, in addition to the above criteria, the following:

(a) Strict adherence to the provisions of this chapter will result in an inability of the applicant to provide adequate WCF services within Lewis County; and

(b) The granting of the variance will not adversely affect views from designated scenic highways or recognized areas of historic or cultural significance. [Ord. 1177A §2, 2001]

Staff Response:

A variance has not been requested. This section does not apply.

LCC Section 15.50.040:

Applications for the locating and development of wireless communications facilities, and permit approval shall include the following:

(1) Application content for all facilities:

(a) A narrative demonstrating how the proposal meets the criteria in the above sections involving Site Location, Development Standards, and Design Standards.

Staff Response:

A narrative was submitted with the application. The application was determined to be complete on August 11, 2025. This criterion has been met.

(b) A comprehensive description of the existing or proposed facilities including the technical reasons for the design and configuration of the facility, design and dimensional information, coverage schemes, and the capability of future collocation opportunities.

Staff Response:

The application met these requirements. This criterion has been met.

(c) Documentation that establishes the applicant's right to use the site shall be provided at the time of application by a copy of the proposed lease agreement, easement agreement or license agreement; or, in the alternative, a copy of a recorded memorandum of lease (or other agreement) between the parcel owner(s) and the applicant.

Staff Response:

A redacted lease was submitted with the application. This criterion has been met.

(d) If camouflage technology is proposed, the applicant shall provide a complete description of the suggested camouflage, including style and materials to be used, a photographic depiction of the proposed facility, and a maintenance plan detailing provisions for the continued effectiveness of the suggested camouflage for the life of the facility.

Staff Response:

The proposed facility is not designed with camouflage technology. This criterion does not apply.

(e) An analysis of the proposal area and discussion of factors influencing the decision to target the proposed location. Such analysis shall include the good faith efforts and measures taken to secure a higher priority location; how and why such efforts were unsuccessful; and how and why the proposed site is essential to meet service demands for the geographic service area.

Staff Response:

The application included an analysis of the area. The application states that there are no higher priority/preference locations within the target area. The proposed facility is the highest available location and is essential to meet service demands. The application included a RF engineering letter of the area. In addition to the

application, the applicant provided multiple studies of the area as a result of the SEPA Appeal and response to comments (Staff Exhibit 11). These criteria have been met.

(f) The application materials shall include a photographic analysis of the proposed site, including a representation of existing conditions and photographic simulations depicting views of any new support structures or towers.

Staff Response:

A photographic analysis was included with the application. This criterion has been met.

(g) Any additional applicable information the administrator deems necessary to adequately review the proposal.

Staff Response:

A wireless communication facility application was submitted on July 18, 2025, and determined complete on August 11, 2025 (Staff Exhibit 2).

(2) Additionally, application content for new support towers:

(a) A site plan, which in addition to the relevant tower descriptions above-noted, clearly indicates the location of the proposed facility in relation to:

(i) Significant features within 1,000 feet including, but not limited to, existing and/or proposed site structures, public rights-of way, residential developments (i.e., subdivisions, master planned communities, and urban residential areas), adjacent land uses, and properties used for public purposes;

(ii) Governmental jurisdictional boundaries within 500 feet of the proposal boundaries; and

(iii) Priority habitat and endangered/threatened species habitat areas within a 1,000 feet as mapped or defined by the state or federal Departments of Fish and Wildlife.

(b) Elevation drawings of the proposed site and facility, including the tower, equipment structures, antennas, mounts and, if applicable, any existing structures, if deemed relevant for screening or analyses. Other applicable features, including but not limited to security fencing and screening shall be included.

(c) Proposals for new support towers shall include a detailed landscaping and screening plan, including existing and proposed vegetation, installation procedures, and landscaping/screening maintenance plans.

(d) Applicants shall present an analysis of existing WCF's within the intended service area, describing the status of collocation opportunities at these sites. The county may deny a new support tower proposal if future collocation is not provided or if the applicant is unable to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the administrator

that collocation on an existing tower is not feasible within the intended service area.

(e) The application materials shall include a report stamped, dated and signed by a licensed professional engineer registered in the State of Washington demonstrating the following:

(i) The facility complies with all requirements of the International Building Code;

(ii) The structural capability of the facility will support collocated antennas (if applicable);

(iii) The facility complies with all applicable standards of the FAA and FCC, including RF energy standards.

(iv) The basis for the calculation of capacities.

(f) The location of new support towers in relation to any national wildlife refuge.

(g) Applicants shall provide evidence of compliance with FAA requirements at the time of application.

(h) All applicable fees are paid at the time of application submission.

Staff Response:

A wireless communication facility application was submitted on July 18, 2025 and determined complete on August 11, 2025 (Staff Exhibit 2). The site plan requirements were established with the conditionally approved MSR (Staff Exhibit 3). Item (e) is outdated code that existed prior to Community Development implementing the Master Site Review process in 2017. Prior to 2017 permits were applied for prior to planning approval. The Master Site Review process now reviews proposals for compliance with zoning and critical areas prior to the applicant submitting building permits. Any items related to the physical construction of the structure, including building code compliance is reviewed with the development permit. This proposal will require a Building Permit to be issued by Community Development at which time the appropriate codes and regulations will be reviewed. These criteria have been met.

(3) Application review and appeal.

(a) All wireless communications facility applications shall be heard in an open record hearing by the Lewis County hearing examiner pursuant to Chapter [2.25](#) LCC for both building permit and construction standards review under this chapter.

(b) Upon receipt of an application under either subsections (1) or (2) of this section, the county shall notify all property owners abutting or within 300 feet of the property which is the subject of the permit, to notify them of the proceeding and of their right to participate. State and federal agencies overseeing affected scenic highways, priority habitat or historic places, noted under LCC [15.50.030](#)(2), shall

also receive notice. The notice of the proceeding shall also be published in the newspaper of record, at the applicant's expense.

(c) The hearing examiner may condition such wireless communications facility approval based on written recommendations in environmental documents, and as otherwise necessary to comply with the requirements of this chapter, the county comprehensive plan, development regulations, and environmental regulations.

(d) The hearing examiner shall issue a decision which shall be final for County purposes. Any party aggrieved by the decision of the hearing examiner, with standing as provided by Chapter [36.70C](#) RCW, LUPA, may appeal such decision pursuant to LCC [2.25.140](#), with further appeal to superior court pursuant to Chapter [2.25](#) LCC.

(4) Temporary WCFs. In order to facilitate continuity of services during maintenance or repair of existing installations, or prior to completion of construction of a new WCF, temporary wireless communication facilities shall be allowed subject to administrator review. Temporary WCFs shall not be in place or in use in excess of 180 days at any one location during any given 12-month period. Temporary WCF's shall not have a permanent foundation, and shall be removed within 30 days of suspension of services they provide or with lapse of the 12 months, whichever is the earlier.

Staff Response:

As previously stated, a Public Hearing will be held in compliance with LCC. This criteria will be met.

K. CONCLUSIONS

With the conditions of approval recommended in this report, the proposed wireless communication facility will comply with the requirements of the Lewis County Code.

L. RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Wireless Communication Facility application from Harmoni Towers, file number WCF25-0002 be **approved**, subject to the following conditions:

1. The applicant/owner shall comply with the Conditions of Approval identified in MSR25-0118 – issued on April 9, 2025. (Staff Exhibit 3)
2. Building permits for the tower, auxiliary equipment and security fencing are required to be applied for and issued prior to construction.
3. A fill and grade permit is required.

4. A Geotechnical Report is required to be submitted with the building permit. The report is required to include any access improvements needed to access the construction site.
5. Any damage to the private roads as a result of the construction of the facility shall be repaired by the applicant.
6. Any work within the County Right-of-Way will require a Work in the Right-of-Way Permit issued by Lewis County Public Works.
7. All proposed development shall be consistent with the criteria outlined in Lewis County Code (LCC) 15.50.
8. Installation of artificial lighting on the tower shall be prohibited unless required by the FAA. Security lighting for equipment shelters or cabinets and other on-the-ground auxiliary equipment is allowed, as long as the lighting utilizes "cut-off" type fixtures and is down-shielded to keep direct light within the site boundaries.
9. The owner of the tower shall not deny collocation of public safety communication equipment at fair market value or other cost agreed by the parties, as required by LCC 15.50.030(1)(c).
10. The owner of the tower shall not deny a wireless provider the ability to collocate on their facility at a fair market value or at another cost basis agreed to by the affected parties, as required by LCC 15.50.030(2)(b).
11. The wireless communication facility shall not be used for signage, symbols, flags, banners, nor other devices or objects attached to, designed into or painted on any portion of the wireless communication facility except: emergency information, public safety warnings, and any additional signage required by a governmental agency, in compliance with LCC 15.50.030(4).
12. The wireless communication facility shall not generate noise levels in excess of maximum standards set forth in Chapter 173-60 WAC. Generators may be operated only for emergency purposes, in compliance with LCC 15.50.030(5).
13. Any auxiliary equipment installed to support future collocations at this site must meet the 25 foot setback from the parent parcel's property lines as required by LCC 15.50.035(2)(c).
14. Any new or auxiliary equipment installed at this site must be enclosed by a minimum six (6) foot high, security fence and screening consistent with LCC 15.50.035(3).

M. EXHIBITS

Staff Exhibit 1	Wireless Communication Facility Application WCF25-0002
Staff Exhibit 2	WCF25-0002 Letter of Completeness
Staff Exhibit 3	Conditionally Approved MSR25-0118
Staff Exhibit 4	SEPA Comments from Internal Departments
Staff Exhibit 5	SEPA Comments from Public
Staff Exhibit 6	Zoning and surround properties
Staff Exhibit 7	SEPA DNS and Checklist
Staff Exhibit 8	APL25-0002 Transmittal Memo
Staff Exhibit 9	Dismissal of APL25-0002
Staff Exhibit 10	Applicant Response to Public Comment
Staff Exhibit 11	RF and Site Reports