

**CENTRAL PUGET SOUND  
GROWTH MANAGEMENT HEARINGS BOARD  
STATE OF WASHINGTON**

MAXINE KEESLING,	)	<b>Case No. 97-3-0027</b>
Petitioner,	)	<b>ORDER DENYING PETITIONER’S</b>
v.	)	<b>MOTION ON FORMER ISSUE</b>
KING COUNTY,	)	
Respondent.	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	

---

**I. Procedural Background**

On September 24, 1997, the Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board (the **Board**) received a Petition for Review from Maxine Keesling (hereafter referred to as **Keesling**). The matter was assigned Case No. 97-3-0027, and captioned as ***Keesling v. King County***.

The Board held a prehearing conference on November 12, 1997, at the Board's office, 2329 One Union Square, Seattle. Board member Joseph W. Tovar, Presiding Officer in this matter, conducted the conference. Petitioner Maxine Keesling appeared *pro se*. Charles E. Maduell and Peter G. Ramels represented the County.

On this same date, the Board issued the Prehearing Order (the **Prehearing Order**) which set forth the four legal issues in this case and established a final schedule.

On December 2, 1997, the Board received “Petitioner’s Motion on Former Issue” (**Petitioner’s Motion on Former Issue**). Petitioner’s Motion on Former Issue states that, on November 24, 1997, the County adopted Proposed Ordinance 97-492, the legislation that had been discussed at the prehearing conference but not listed as a consistency issue. Petitioner requested addition of a legal issue as follows:

**Legal Issue No. 5**

***Is the Sammamish Valley Agricultural Production District Buffer Special District Overlay inconsistent with King County Ordinance No. 12927?***

On December 3, 1997, the Board issued an “Order on Petitioner’s Motion on Former Issue” which set dates for the County to submit a Reponse brief and Keesling to submit a Reply. On December 10, 1997, the Board received “King County’s Response to Petitioner’s Motion on Former Issue.” On December 15, 1997, the Board received “Petitioner’s Response to King County’s Response to Petitioner’s Motion on Former Issue.”

## **II. ORDER**

Petitioner’s Motion on Former issue is **denied**. The four issues set forth in the Prehearing Order are the only matters to be addressed in subsequent briefing and oral argument in the present case. So ORDERED this 15th day of December, 1997.

CENTRAL PUGET SOUND GROWTH MANAGEMENT HEARINGS BOARD

---

Joseph W. Tovar, AICP  
Presiding Officer