Tuesday, August 22, 2006

Kittitas County Planning Commission
411 N. Ruby St., Suite 2
Ellensburg, WA  98926

RE: 2006 Comprehensive Plan amendments 06-18 and 06-19

Honorable Commission Members;

Please include this correspondence in the public record on the matter of Kittitas County Comprehensive Plan amendments.

I am writing to express concern regarding the approach taken toward review of the following proposals:

06-18 – American Forest Resources LLC, 6,257 acres from “Commercial Forest” designation to “Forest and Range” entirely in the Teanaway River watershed; and,
06-19 – American Forest Resources LLC, 640 acres from “Commercial Forest” designation to “Forest and Range” entirely in the Swauk Creek watershed.

The approach taken toward approval of these requests appears to be in violation of the State Environmental Policy Act, which requires review of land use actions that may have a significant adverse environmental impact (RCW 43.21C.030). If approved in their current form, these requests would result in conversion of large areas of commercial forest to residential development. Although these land use re-designations are non-project actions, they would lay the procedural groundwork to then apply for rezone and subsequent development opportunities.

The following adverse environmental impacts would occur:

1. **Loss of instream flow during summer base flow conditions.** Both the Teanaway River and Swauk Creek suffer from inadequate stream flows during the late summer. With residential development, exempt wells will be drilled to provide domestic and landscaping irrigation. Negative impacts to fisheries and wildlife resources as well as downstream irrigation interests will occur. The USDI Bureau of Reclamation and Bonneville Power Administration has expended over $5 million toward improved instream flow in the lower Teanaway, through installing pressurized irrigation systems. These efforts would fail with poorly planned development, as would happen through this application.
2. **Loss of riparian corridors.** Residential development will fragment the corridor along both the Teanaway River and Swauk Creek. It is important to note that the proposal in the Teanaway would involve land adjacent to all three branches (west, middle and north forks), and the mainstem.

3. **Loss of wildlife migration corridors.** Elk, deer and other large species need winter range that occurs in the low lands, including land in these areas. Several years ago a local Ellensburg hunter harvested the second largest bull elk ever taken during the archery season in Washington State in the Teanaway watershed. Approval of these proposals would compromise future hunting opportunities.

4. **Increased challenges in addressing water quality problems.** Residential development will result in increased stormwater runoff, the potential for delivery of septic effluent to the stream, and increased siltation from riparian clearing. Both the Teanaway and Swauk already have significant water quality/quantity problems. Past mining and highway maintenance have elevated sediment levels in the Swauk (winter sanding of the roadway introduces sediment to the stream course). Summer water temperatures in the Teanaway are high enough that the Washington Department of Ecology has gone through a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) planning and implementation process, which attempts to redress high temperature.

The most serious problem with these requests is that the process for approval is flawed. Public process for designating resource lands is described in WAC 365-190-040(2):

> “Counties and cities shall involve the public in classifying and designating natural resource lands and critical areas.
> (a) Public participation:
> (i) Public participation should include at a minimum: Landowners; representatives of agriculture, forestry, mining, business, environmental, and community groups; tribal governments; representatives of adjacent counties and cities; and state agencies. The public participation program should include early and timely public notice of pending designations and regulations.
> (ii) Counties and cities should consider using: Technical and citizen advisory committees with broad representation, press releases, news conferences, neighborhood meetings, paid advertising (e.g., newspaper, radio, T.V., transit), newsletters, and other means beyond the required normal legal advertising and public notices. Plain, understandable language should be used. The department of community development will provide technical assistance in preparing public participation plans, including: A pamphlet series, workshops, and a list of agencies available to provide help.”

Presumably, the process for de-designating almost 7,000 acres of resource lands would involve a similar process, however this has not occurred. The requests have been confusing, and have been forwarded separate from the review of the Resource Lands Advisory Committee, which has been meeting to develop strategies for protection and management of resources lands. Why have these
proposals not been included in the Resource Lands Committee process?

I would strongly recommend working through a sub-area planning process for both the Teanaway and Swauk watersheds, to evaluate comprehensively the following interests/concerns:

1. Development Impacts and Mitigation Options, (including infrastructure, transportation, etc.);
2. Cost to Public Services;
3. Need for additional rural development (based upon statistics from the Office of Financial Management);
4. Fish and wildlife habitat;
5. Recreation; and,

Sincerely,

Philip Rigdon
Deputy Director of Natural Resources
Yakama Nation
Hi Susan,

For PC record.

Joanna Valencia
Planner II
Kittitas County Community Development Services
[P] 509.962.7046
[F] 509.962.7682
joanna.valencia@co.kittitas.wa.us

Hi there,

Please remove my August 22nd letter to the Planning Commission from the 2006 Plan Amendment public record and replace it with the attached letter, dated August 23rd, 2006. I inadvertently added incorrect language in the Aug. 22nd edition, so I amended the letter and added further detail on a few specific file #s. –Sorry for the confusion. Please let me know if you need further clarification.

Unfortunately I have to work tonight and tomorrow night, so I hope you can help convey my support for the RLAC recommendations and RIDGE proposal. They are very complimentary.

Thanks!
Kelly

Kelly Clark-Larimer
Habitat Biologist
Yakima-Klickitat Fisheries Project
(509) 933-1210 office
(509) 949-2176 cell
kelly.ykfp@elltel.net
Hello:

Please submit and distribute my attached written comments, and supporting documents into the public record for the 2006 Comprehensive Plan Map and Text Amendment hearing before the Kittitas County Planning Commission (set for Monday and Tuesday, August 21-22, 2006). Confirmation of this request would be greatly appreciated.

Thank you for your time,

Kelly

**Kelly Clark-Larimer**
Habitat Biologist
Yakima-Klickitat Fisheries Project
(509) 933-1210 office
(509) 949-2176 cell
kelly.ykfp@elltel.net
This document serves as a quick guide to the issues that the Resource Lands Advisory Committee recommendations are addressing as part of the 2006 Kittitas County Comprehensive Plan Update.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Solution</th>
<th>How it works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determining the availability of water and where growth is suitable</td>
<td>Require that prior to final approval of all subdivisions that proof of a</td>
<td>Prior to final approval of all subdivisions, a connection to an approved water source or a well must be in place that is producing water in sufficient quality and quantity for domestic use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pending on such.</td>
<td>sufficient water source is in place for domestic use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do we keep lands currently designated Commercial Agriculture and</td>
<td>Develop a Transfer of Development Right (TDR) and Purchase of Development</td>
<td>Conduct a TDR, PDR analysis and program development that would identify “receiving” areas for the development rights and identify areas where development rights would be transferred or purchased from.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Forest in those designations</td>
<td>Rights (PDR) program to allow the transfer and purchase of development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rights for the Commercial Agriculture and Commercial Forest designations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The development of such programs would allow for lands designated as</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>such to maintain the commercial use, but allow for the land to still</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>obtain development value by selling off development rights.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of economic viability of Commercial Forest lands due to the</td>
<td>Identify planning tools to allow for maintaining Commercial Forest</td>
<td>Planning tools include: development within two years of the adoption of the Plan of a subarea plan in the Teanaway Drainage Basin prior to development other one unit per 80 acres, identifying areas appropriate for possibly siting a Master Planned Resort (MPR)/Fully Contained Communities (FCC), development of a TDR/PDR program for Commercial Forest lands, allow for the use of the Cluster Subdivision Code in the Commercial Forest designation, develop a Forest Practices Ordinance that identifies the process for conversion of land currently in forestry to other uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>closing of key wood mills to the county. Of particular concern is the</td>
<td>lands, while maintaining options that allow for Commercial Forest land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Forest lands located in the Teanaway Drainage Basin.</td>
<td>owners to realize the economic potential through the development of their</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem</td>
<td>Solution</td>
<td>How it works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rezones</td>
<td>Achieve consistency between the County Land Use and Zoning maps</td>
<td>Rezones should be limited to occur only when a Comprehensive Plan Land Use map designation change is approved within the context of the yearly review cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of agricultural land with good soils and irrigation, regardless of land use designation, should be minimized to the greatest extent possible. The overall footprint of development in the Rural designations should be minimized to the greatest extent possible.</td>
<td>Develop incentives that encourage the preservation of larger land tracts suitable for agricultural use. Provide incentives for commercially viable agricultural lands to be able to maintain farming but also allow for development potential to be realized through the development of TDR/PDR programs. Density in the Rural land use designation should be based on a public benefit rating system.</td>
<td>An element of the public benefit rating system should give high recognition to development that maintains agricultural land with good soils and irrigation by clustering development on the least productive of these lands and provides for large (greater than 40 acres) intact acreages suitable for agricultural use. TDR/PDR Programs All parcel creation in the Rural designation below a density of 1 unit per 20 acres shall use the public benefit rating system and shall use clustering to maximize the retention of open space and minimize the development footprint. Densities between 1 unit per 20 acres (1:20) and 1 unit per 5 acres (1:5) should be based on the use of a public benefit rating system at the time of parcel creation. Density of 1 unit per 2.5 acres (1:2.5) may be obtained through a TDR/PDR program that incorporates a density transfer from the Commercial Agriculture designation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider how the county will develop not just within the 20 year planning period but within the next 100 years – Planning for the future.</td>
<td>Develop a method to be able to identify areas appropriate for growth beyond 20 years that goes beyond identified UGA/UGN boundaries</td>
<td>Development and implementation of a “Rural Transition Overlay Zone” in the Rural land use designations that will identify areas of the county for growth beyond 20 years. This zone will provide for orderly development beyond the 20 year planning period. This will also provide for the identification of receiving areas for development rights from the Commercial Agricultural zone related to the development of a TDR/PDR program in the county.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact Darryl or Joanna at (509) 962-7506 or visit the County Website at www.co.kittitas.wa.us/cds for more information.
May 8, 2006

Kittitas County Board of Commissioners
205 West Fifth Ave, Suite 108
Ellensburg, WA 98926

Re: Recommendations from the Resource Lands Advisory Committee.

Dear Commissioners,

The purpose of this document is to forward to you the recommendations of the Resource Lands Advisory Committee (RLAC) regarding the update of the Kittitas County Comprehensive Plan. This recommendation represents a cumulative effort of hundreds of hours of individual committee members’ time over the last three months. As a group we took our charge seriously and with considerable sense of the importance of this effort to the County for the next 20 to 100 years. We thank you for the opportunity and for your foresight in having this diverse group of people consider the future of Kittitas County and the ability to offer for your consideration our recommendations.

Our recommendations encompass three major categories. These are:

- Policy discussion and recommendations including a vision statement.
- Identification and discussion of the recommended land use policies
- Suggested text changes to the GPOs within the context of the existing comprehensive plan. (note: the RLAC is requesting one additional week to conclude the review of this element.)

The recommendations specific to each area are attached for your review.

The recommendations as forwarded represent consensus of the 10 member RLAC. There was much discussion and spirited debate on several issues. The RLAC met this challenge through consideration and respect of the varying points of view and perspectives. These discussions led to a better understanding of the varying points of view and perspectives and we sincerely hope this will serve as an example to the community how consideration and respect can translate into a successful effort.

We anticipate that, upon your review, you will forward these recommendations to the Planning Commission for public discussion. We also recommend a series of open houses prior to the Planning Commission hearings to provide the public a chance to become familiar with these recommendations allowing for discussion at the Planning Commission that is well informed. As a committee, we look forward to working closely with the Planning Commission to review these recommendations.

Once the overarching policy decisions are in place it is our request that the RLAC reconvene, hopefully in early fall, to review the development code that will implement
the adopted policies of the updated comprehensive plan. We recognize the importance of
developing and adopting policies that reflect the vision of the community but also
recognize the importance of the details contained within the Code that will implement
these policies. We would like the opportunity to insure that these implementation codes
reflect the vision and intent of the adopted policy direction and would look forward to
this opportunity to assist in this review.

Finally, we would like to thank you for the commitment of staff time to assist us in this
effort. We appreciate the effort and consideration that was extended by Community
Development Services in support of the RLAC.

Respectfully Submitted,

Resource Lands Advisory Committee

Chad Bala
Charles Weidenbach
David Gerth
Fritz Glover
Jeff Jones
Jerry Martens
Karen Poulsen
Kelly Larimer
Pat Deneen
Scott Nicolai
Resource Lands Advisory Committee (RLAC)
Policy Recommendations

RLAC Vision Statement

Vision Statement

We will continue to manage Kittitas County to ensure long-term environmental and economic sustainability. This means a landscape that supports the full range of human uses, from natural resource management, community development and recreational opportunities, while maintaining the rural setting and quality of life that Kittitas County is known for. The vision will be accomplished by:

1. Creating and implementing management policies and principles based on careful, well thought out planning that provide incentives, assistance and flexibility to landowners.
2. Working in collaboration with knowledgeable and involved parties, industry, the business community and other stakeholders.
3. Recognizing the historical, aesthetic and recreational values while improving the economic base of the County.
4. Providing the opportunities for new businesses, cottage industry and services as well as affordable housing.
5. Promoting open space in strategically identified areas that provide public benefit.
6. Identify, develop and implement economically viable strategies to support agriculture, forest and mineral resource activities.

Policy Issues and Recommendations.

Water for domestic use.
The RLAC recognizes that water availability will be among a handful of issues that will determine how and where growth will occur in Kittitas County. Decisions regarding the areas where growth will be encouraged and directed should include discussion on the availability of adequate water supplies. The RLAC recommends:

A viable and demonstrated water supply shall be required prior to all final plat approvals. No plat shall receive final approval without a connection to an approved water source or a well in place producing water in sufficient quality and quantity for domestic use.
Boundaries of the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map designations.
The RLAC does not recommend changing the current boundaries of the land use
designations on the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map with the exception of the
following situations:

Where it is determined that the Urban Growth Areas or Urban Growth Nodes
should be modified due to change in the population forecast or refinement of
urban services information.

The addition of a “Rural Transition Overlay” designation (this will be discussed
with further detail later in this report)

The addition of a “Limited Area of More Intense Rural Development” (LAMIRD)
designation where deemed appropriate.

Encourage Urban Growth Areas and Rural Transition Overlay designations to
areas that minimize conversion of prime agricultural farm land.

The Ellensburg Urban Growth Area south of Interstate 90 should be reconsidered
to recognize potential impacts to the Yakima River and flood hazards to
development.

Recognize the need for parity in Land Use designations.
Develop incentives for those lands that are contained in the Commercial Agriculture and
Commercial Forest designations so that property owners will want to remain in those
designations. The RLAC recommends:

The implementation of Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) and Purchase of
Development Rights (PDR) programs to allow the transfer and purchase of development
rights from the Commercial Agriculture and Commercial Forest designations following a
TDR, PDR analysis and program development. A provision for this program is identified
in the land use element preferred alternative found later in this report.

Require sub area planning in the Teanaway Drainage Basin prior to development
other than at one unit per 80 acres. Sub area plan to be developed within two years of the
adoption of this plan.

Allow the use of the Cluster Subdivision Code in the Commercial Forest
designation. Develop a Forest Practices Ordinance that identifies the process for
conversion of land currently in forestry to other uses.
Create consistency between the Land Use map and Zoning map.
The RLAC recommends:

The Land Use Map and Zoning Map should be consistent. Rezones should be limited to occur only when a comprehensive plan land use map designation change is approved within the context of the yearly review cycle.

Density in the Rural land use designation should be based on a public benefit rating system.
The RLAC recommends:

Base density in the rural designations should be 1 unit per 20 acres. Densities between 1 unit per 20 acres and 1 unit per 5 acres should be based on a public benefit rating system and determined using the public benefit rating system at the time of parcel creation. Density of 1 unit to 2.5 acre may be obtained through a density transfer from Commercial Agriculture.

The overall footprint of development in the rural designations should be minimized to the greatest extent possible.
The RLAC recommends:

All parcel creation in the rural designation below a density of 1 unit per 20 acres shall use the public benefit rating system and shall use clustering to maximize the retention of open space and minimize the development footprint.

Consider how the county will develop not just within the 20 year planning period but within the next 100 years.
The RLAC recommends:

Development and Implementation of a “Rural Transition Overlay Zone” in the Rural designations that will identify areas of the county for growth beyond 20 years. This overlay zone will allow for orderly development for growth beyond the 20 year planning period and will provide a receiving area for development rights from the Commercial Agriculture Zone.

Loss of Agricultural land with good soils and irrigation, regardless of land use designation, should be minimized to the greatest extent possible.
The RLAC recommends:

An element of the public benefit rating system should give high recognition to development that maintains agricultural land with good soils and irrigation by clustering development on the least productive of these lands and provides for large (greater than 40 acres) intact acreages suitable for agricultural use.
Cluster / Transfer of Development Rights Recommendation

General boundaries of the existing Land Use map remain for Commercial Ag and Commercial Forest. Rural boundary remains similar except for the introduction of the Rural Transition Zone.  80 acre density for Commercial Forest, 20 acre density for Commercial Agriculture, a 20 acre base density for Rural and 5 acre base density for Rural Transition.

Any development within the rural zone below one unit per 20 acres requires Cluster Development using the public benefit rating system. Up to one unit per 5 acres with minimum 50% open space. Minimum development size is 20 acres. Density may be increased to allow one unit per 2.5 acres however the acquisition of development rights from the Commercial Agriculture land use designation is required for each unit in excess of one unit per 5 acres.

Development within the rural transition overlay zone is to provide for and accommodate urban levels of development in the 20 to 100 year planning period. Development must be by cluster subdivision, base density of 1 unit per 5 acres at a 100% bonus density. Minimum 25% open space and minimum 50% urban redevelopment area (identified by a pre-plat). Development of the urban redevelopment area requires the acquisition of development rights transferred from the Commercial Agriculture Land Use designation. Mixed use development is allowed for the purpose of supporting future urban levels of development.

The minimum density allowed in the Urban Growth areas is established at 4 units per acre. Additional density may be allowed with the acquisition of development rights from Commercial Ag land use designation.

Due to the consistency of the Land Use Map and the Zoning Map, no rezones would be allowed except in conjunction with a Comprehensive Plan amendment.
Kittitas County Planning Commission
Kittitas County Community Development Services
411 N. Ruby St., Suite 2
Ellensburg, WA 98926

Kittitas Planning Commission members:

I am a member of the Kittitas County Rural Lands Advisory Committee (RLAC), and currently work as a Habitat Biologist for the Yakama Nation –Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project. Prior to my current employment, I worked as a Senior Natural Resources Planner for Yakima County for over 4 ½ years. Throughout my experiences, I have gained a well-rounded and technically sound approach to land use planning processes and public participation through a wide variety of planning, research, and citizen stakeholder projects.

As a member of the RLAC, the recommendations that we made acknowledge and address the need to both:
1.) protect public interests and;
2.) provide flexibility and parity for private landowners.

Direct benefits to the public and private sectors could be mutually met by applying several of the 2006 Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment applications to the updated and adopted Comprehensive Plan in 2007. Of specific concern are File #s 06-01, 06-02, 06-05, 06-06, 06-0906-17, 06-18, and 06-19 (Table 1, 2), which request to de-designate Lands of Long Term Commercial Significance. None of these applications have gone through the de-designation process, to adequately demonstrate that they no longer meet the specific criteria that define the lands status as a long-term protected resource. If these applications are approved as is, they are clearly subject to legal challenge.

### Table 1. County Commercial Agriculture to Rural

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File No</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06-01</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-05</td>
<td>65.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-06</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-09</td>
<td>35.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-17</td>
<td>54.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>219.74 Acres</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. County Commercial Forestry to Forest & Range 20; and Rural

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File No</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06-02</td>
<td>320.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-18</td>
<td>6,256.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-19</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>7,217.61 Acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The RLAC, and other citizen and staff derived recommendations for the Plan Update, provide clear, rational, and creative policies to alleviate reoccurring problems that have generated many private and public concerns (see attached RLAC documents). These recommendations, if adopted, would dramatically improve the public, county staff, and elected officials ability to solicit, review/analyze, and make recommendations on current and long-range planning efforts in a clear and comprehensive fashion. File # 06-10, the RIDGE and other 2006 Text Amendment request, displays well-thought, substantive language that meets the mutual goals and objectives of the RLAC effort.

Specific to all the 2006 Map Amendment Requests (From pg. 2, RLAC Policy Issues and Recommendations):

Boundaries of the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map Designations.
The RLAC does not recommend changing the current boundaries of the land use designations on the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map with the exception of the following situations:
- Where it determined that the Urban Growth Areas or Urban Growth Nodes should be modified due to change in the populations forecast or refinement of urban services information [this should be done through the County Wide Policy Planning process so that the cities and county can plan accordingly].
- The addition of a “Rural Transition Overlay” designation [discussed later in the report].
- The addition of a “Limited Area of More Intense Rural Development” (LARMIRD) designation where deemed appropriate.
- Encourage Urban Growth Areas and Rural Transition Overlay designations to areas that minimize conversion of prime agricultural farm land. …

Advancement of several of the aforementioned 2006 Plan Amendment Requests (Table 1, 2) would severely compromise and undermine the need, intent, and purpose of the 20 Year Plan Update and the progress made by the RLAC, which is composed of widely-diverse individuals that have formulated employable recommendations that can have a progressive and positive impact on the way our county changes in the near and long-term.

I respectfully ask the Planning Commission to recommend to the Board of County Commissioners that all 2006 Comprehensive Plan Map Amendments that are deemed questionable in nature for long-term planning needs, be re-evaluated and reconsidered under the updated and adopted Comprehensive Plan, should they choose to resubmit.
A one year delay is by no means an unreasonable request by the PC or BOCC to the applicants and the public, especially considering the fact that many GMA planning counties only consider changes in land use designation once every 4 years.

Most importantly, by allowing the re-designation of up to 8,346.07 acres (13.5 square miles) in one plan amendment cycle (this includes all Map Amendment acres requested), let alone that amount of acreage over the next 20 years, we would dramatically limit our land use planning options to meet well-defined near-term needs, and would literally obliterate the ability of future generations to adapt to changing socio-economic variables, environmental/resource needs, and many other unforeseen factors. Sound, technical analysis and public input must be solicited and considered before such large scale designation changes are made.

Moreover, my husband and I are both Cle Elum-Roslyn High and Central Washington University graduates, own a local business, and would like to someday raise a family here, if it is the right place to be in 2, 5, 10, 20 and/or 50 years. Please, let’s give local folks a chance to stay and live in our beautiful county. Let’s define our growth, not let growth define us.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration,

Kelly Larimer
RLAC Member/Concerned Citizen
For the Planning Commission record

From: P. Cantieni, M. Taylor [mailto:pico@eburg.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 23, 2006 2:59 PM
To: Darryl Piercy
Subject: AFR comp. plan amendment and rezone;

Please put me on record as being in opposition to AFR's request for comp. plan reclassification and rezone of their Teanaway properties.

Yes, I know; you can't stop "progress", development is inevitable, property owners have rights, the county has limited legal authority to restrict development, etc, etc. BUT! The development of AFR land in the Teanaway has been a ticking time-bomb for years now. The county has known for a long time that sooner or later this request would come. This is a huge area of land we're talking about, not some two-bit mom-and-pop development. The addition of many miles of roads and thousands of homes will have enormous impacts on the Teanaway drainage. Run-off, erosion, drain field seepage, exempt wells competing for water, fire protection both residential and wildland, fire and medical aid access, traffic management and access to public land recreation come to mind. I simply can't imagine that the county could sit back and claim non-significance for this proposal.

Sure, there's going to be development of AFR land in the Teanaway. We can't simply raise the drawbridge and declare the Teanaway an undevelopable zone. BUT.....The county MUST act responsibly to exercise it's oversight authority. The county must get out ahead of the curve on this.

1) The county must make sure that a balance be maintained between allowing development and at the same time preserving the natural attributes and recreational opportunities which the Teanaway Valley offers and which make the valley an attractive place to live.

2) the county must be hard-nosed about requiring that developers bear at least part of the cost of the infrastructure needed to ensure that folks can live in the Teanaway Valley safely and happily.

Sincerely;

Pico Cantieni
5920 Red Bridge Rd.
Cle Elum
WA 98922 674-4632
August 22, 2006

Kittitas County Community Development Services
411 N. Ruby Street, Suite #2
Ellensburg, WA 98926

Dear Planning Commissioners,

According to the Trust for Public Land,
- Each day, America loses more than 6,000 acres of rural land to subdivision, highways and malls.
- American farmland is disappearing at a rate of two acres every minute.
- Metropolitan Phoenix now covers an area the size of the state of Delaware.
- By 2050, America will be running out of all open space.
Please keep these facts in mind as developers plow forward with rezone proposals.

We have lived on Watson Cutoff Road for 8 years. One of the stipulations of acreage ownership on this road was that it could not be subdivided. To our knowledge, there has been no extensive environmental impact study or scientific research regarding housing developments. We strongly object to the proposed Pine View Estates Cluster Housing Development on Upper Peoh Point Road for the following reasons:

1. Limited water resources:
   Has there been an environmental review, analyzing the impact of development on our water resources? Why has well drilling occurred on the proposed property when this has not been approved? After the February 28th 2003 earthquake, we found our water pressure extremely compromised. Many wells in the area are going dry. Water availability is essential for property owners. If developers are intending to have 14 houses on .5 or .7 acres of land each, where will the water source come from?

   The Department of Ecology’s Environmental Review Coordinator, Gwen Clear, sent a letter to Joanna Valencia, Community Development Services, dated July 3, 2006, recommending a class A well for this proposed development. One class B well will not be sufficient for these families and yet the commissioners seem to be ignoring the recommendation.

   We pay for water rights yearly. If users exceed the limit of 5000 gallons per day, The Department of Ecology also recommends metering our wells. A seasonal stream runs across part of this proposed property. The water helps filter pollution. Without it, pollution will run downstream. Please
take the time to research and consider water availability, water quality and surface water run off, even if it means visiting each site where rezoning is proposed. A site visit should hold especially true where 6-8 neighboring residents of a proposed rezone have already challenged the application.

2. Negative impact on vegetation, bird and animal life
   This pristine area is used by elk, deer, coyotes, and horses to name a few. The animals require safety from predators in wooded areas. The area proposed for the cluster housing is wooded and steep. The proposed open space is not. Light pollution will also impact animal and bird habitat.

3. Violation of three acre plots and above
   One of the most attractive features of the agriculture (A-3) zone is low density development. Should this cluster development be approved, the three acre minimum is compromised. Housing projects like this create a plethora of utility problems. Please check the validity of applications carefully.

4. Blue Clay underneath topsoil on proposed cluster property
   The top soil is merely 3 to 7 feet before blue clay appears. This soil is literally rock hard and runs from Upper Peoh Point Road to the Yakima River. The water table cannot handle blue clay soil.

5. Traffic hazards and lack of facilities including but not limited to, waste.
   35 mph speed limit already impacts animal life.
   A gated community with key card access is being proposed for Pine View residents. This type of structure is completely foreign to the environment. The forested land is steep and not suitable for sewage run-off. Will the sewage runoff affect the river?

6. Lack of information, notification and opportunity to collect facts in a timely manner.
   Development is occurring very quickly in the county. Watson Cutoff residents had not been notified of this cluster property. A development of this magnitude impacts all residents within 2 - 5 miles, not just those property owners within 300 feet of the proposed site. We need time to access the full effects of a gated development on the neighborhood and environment.

7. Yakima Indian Tributary
   The spring mentioned above is a tributary of the Yakima River and therefore subject to the Yakima Indian Reservation regulations. Has the Department of Natural Resources been contacted to determine if there are artifacts on this property?

In conclusion, we ask you to refuse the Pine View Estate developers from moving forward with the proposed cluster plot. Furthermore, we believe a
moratorium on cluster plots should be implemented immediately until a thorough environmental review and specific water analysis is conducted and communicated to all residents of Kittitas County. Once we have the facts VS a fill-in-the-blank application, we can better prepare for purposeful, fair, wise and controlled development in Upper County. Here is our opportunity to be a model to other growing communities across America. We owe at least this much to the previous generation and to future generations.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely yours,

Jaqualyn and Robert Trumpy
August 21, 2006

Mr. David Black, Chair
Kittitas County Planning Commission
Kittitas County Community Development Services
411 N Ruby Street, Suite 2
Ellensburg Washington 98926

Dear Chair Black and Members of the Planning Commission:

Subject: Comments on the 2006 Kittitas County Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Update
Sent via e-mail and Overnight Delivery

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the update of the Kittitas County 2006 Kittitas County Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Update. Futurewise is a statewide citizens’ group working to promote healthy communities and cities while protecting working farms and forests for this and future generations. With our local partners, we are also one of the applicants for amendment 06-10.

This letter will first summarize our comments. The letter will then address the requirement to periodically review and revise comprehensive plans, the process that Kittitas County is now undertaking. The letter will comment on the 2006 comprehensive plan amendments. Finally, we request that an environmental impact statement (EIS) be prepared on the site specific comprehensive plan amendments.

Summary of Our Comments

- Recommend approval of amendment File No. 06-10. This comprehensive package of amendments will update the Kittitas County Comprehensive Plan to reflect changing community needs and comply with the Growth Management Act.
- Eliminate densities greater than one dwelling unit per five acres outside of urban growth areas and limited areas of more intense rural development (LAMIRDS). These densities are harming Kittitas County property owners and the county’s economy and character. They are also illegal because they violate the Growth Management Act.
Prepare an environmental impact statement on the proposed site specific amendments. These amendments will adversely affect public facilities and services and the environment necessitating an environmental impact statement before any decision can be made.

Recommend denial of the comprehensive plan amendments that redesignate working forests for other uses. These proposed amendments, which total over 11 square miles, will adversely affect the county’s forest products industry.

Recommend denial of the comprehensive plan amendments that redesignate working farms for other uses. These proposed amendments will reduce the land base of the agricultural industry and adversely impact the ability of neighboring land owners to farm and ranch.

Recommend denial of comprehensive plan amendments that expand urban growth areas or locate urban commercial uses outside the urban growth area without an analysis showing that the expansions are needed to accommodate the county’s adopted growth target. Urban growth areas must be sized to accommodate the county’s population target and the county must show its work, show that the land is needed to accommodate that growth. This the applicants have not done.

Recommend denial of comprehensive plan amendments that expand “urban growth nodes” without an analysis showing that they are within the 1990 built environment of the node. Urban growth nodes are a type of limited area of more intense rural development (LAMIRD) and must be contained with their 1990 built environment.

The Periodic Update Requirement

Why it is Important to Periodically Review and Revise Comprehensive Plans

We appreciate that Kittitas County is undertaking the periodic update of the county comprehensive plan. The Growth Management Act requires periodic updates of comprehensive plans for a variety of reasons. Consider three:

- Communities change. According to the State of Washington Office of Financial Management, in the last ten years Kittitas County’s population has grown from an estimated 30,800 people in 1996 to 37,400 people in 2006. This is an increase of 21.43 percent. From 2000 to 2006, 54 percent of the county’s growth occurred in unincorporated Kittitas County.

---

2 Id.
We know more. In the years since Kittitas County adopted its comprehensive plan, we have learned much about how to make communities better.

The Growth Management Act changes. The Growth Management Act has been amended every year since it was adopted.

So the periodic comprehensive plan updates are opportunities for counties to evaluate their plans to make sure the county is getting the kind of community Kittitas County residents and property owners want. It is also a great opportunity to incorporate the new knowledge of how to make communities better and to make sure the plan is in compliance with the Growth Management Act.

The Periodic Update Requirements

The Growth Management Act, in RCW 36.70A.130(1), requires each city and county in Washington State that fully plans under the Growth Management Act “to take legislative action to review and, if needed, revise its comprehensive land use plan and development regulations to ensure the plan and regulations comply with the requirements of this chapter ....” This means that each county and city must review their entire comprehensive plan and development regulations to ensure they comply with the Growth Management Act.\(^4\) If Kittitas County’s comprehensive plan or development regulations do not fully comply with the GMA, they must be revised by an ordinance or resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners.\(^5\)

The legislature adopted this requirement in 1997 and the original deadline was September 1, 2002.\(^6\) The plans and development regulations were to be updated every five years.\(^7\) In 2002, the deadline for Kittitas County and the cities in Kittitas County was extended four years to December 1, 2006 and the update interval increased to seven years.\(^8\)

Comments on the Proposed 2006 Comprehensive Plan Amendments

We appreciate that the county is undertaking its update. Futurewise has been working closely with a group of local organizations and individuals to prepare suggested

\(^4\) 1000 Friends of Washington and Pro-Whatcom v. Whatcom County; Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board (WWGMHB) Case No. 04-2-0010 Order on Motion to Dismiss p. *7 of 16 (August 2, 2004). The board’s decisions can be found on their website: http://www.gmhb.wa.gov/western/decisions/index.html

\(^5\) RCW 36.70A.130(1) & 1000 Friends of Washington and Pro-Whatcom v. Whatcom County; WWGMHB Case No. 04-2-0010 Order on Motion to Dismiss p. *14 of 16 (August 2, 2004).

\(^6\) 1997 Session Laws, Chapter 429 § 10.

\(^7\) Id.

\(^8\) 2002 Session Laws, Chapter 320 § 1.
comprehensive plan amendments. We will first address that amendment and then the other proposed amendments.

Recommend approval of the Comprehensive Plan Amendments proposed by Kittitas County Community Groups and Others (the RIDGE and Others Amendments) Amendment File No. 06-10

What will the Amendment Do?

Improve Comprehensive Plan Policies
The amendment revises and proposes a variety of comprehensive plan policies to make them clearer and up-to-date. The amendment will increase protection for working farms and forests by setting policies to protect them.

The amendment calls on the county to adopt clear criteria for various comprehensive plan designations and zones. The current Kittitas County comprehensive plan does not have clear provisions outlining what land use designations should apply to land with various characteristics. There has been much recent controversy over rezones. A clear set of criteria for each comprehensive plan designation and zone will make the decision process fairer and smoother. We urge you to adopt these criteria as part of the comprehensive plan update.

The amendment also proposes policies requiring careful consideration of the impacts of comprehensive plan amendments and rezones on neighboring land owners, public facilities such as roads and schools, public services, and the environment before deciding whether to approve them.

Some urge that rezones are necessary to provide for an adequate number of building sites. But our amendment does not prohibit comprehensive plan amendments and rezones, it just requires they be carefully considered. In addition, the Kittitas County Assessor reports that between 1995 and August 4, 2006 10,835 new lots were created in Kittitas County. So it is unclear that many new lots are needed to address housing and employment needs.

The amendment proposes policies to help provide housing affordable to those who live and work in Kittitas County. The policies call for allowing accessory dwelling units and density bonuses for affordable housing along with other measures to make housing more affordable.

Review the existing urban growth areas to make sure they are the right size and will be efficient to serve with public facilities and services.
Another important part of the amendment is that it calls on Kittitas County to review its existing urban growth areas to ensure they are properly sized. The Washington State
Growth Management Act has three key requirements for sizing urban growth areas (UGAs) and amendments to UGAs:

1. The size of the UGA, or amendment, shall be based on the Office of Financial Management’s (OFM) 20-year growth management population forecast for a county. The county with the cities in the county chooses a population target within the OFM range. This target cannot be lower than the low end of the OFM range or higher than the high end. The UGA is then sized to accommodate that population projection and the employment, retail, public, and semi-public uses needed to accommodate the selected population target.\(^9\) UGAs are also required to include open space corridors to link up critical areas, open spaces, and parks.\(^10\)

2. A “reasonable market supply factor may” be included in sizing the UGA.\(^11\) The market supply factor is the percentage of land added beyond that needed to accommodate the OFM projection chosen by the county and cities. The market factor cannot exceed 25 percent unless several factors are met, including local circumstances.\(^12\) The Growth Boards closely review market factors above 25 percent.\(^13\) With records that clearly justified them, industrial market factors of 50 percent have been upheld in some areas, but not in other areas where the record did not justify the larger market factor.\(^14\) A market factor is not required.\(^15\)

In addition to upholding market factors, the Eastern Washington Growth Management Hearings Board has sustained including the additional land in the UGA “... required to realize a jurisdiction’s ‘vision of urban development’ that can be realized over the next 20 years.”\(^16\) This sustainability was upheld in the case of Diehl v. Mason County, 94 Wash. App. 645, 704, 972 P.2d 543, 547 (1999) (Accordingly, the OFM projection places a cap on the amount of land a county may allocate to UGAs.). The case of Save Our Butte, Save Our Basin Society, v. Chelan County, et al., Eastern Washington Growth Management Hearings Board (EWGMHB) Case No. 94-1-0001 Final Decision and Order p. *9 1994 WL 907892 (June 6, 1994).

---

\(^9\) RCW § 36.70A.110(2); Diehl v. Mason County, 94 Wash. App. 645, 654, 972 P.2d 543, 547 (1999)
\(^10\) RCW § 36.70A.160.
\(^15\) Bremerton at pp. *45 – 47.
twenty years." This vision is constrained by a community's ability to provide adequate public facilities and services without decreasing service levels below locally established minimum standards, the goal of discouraging sprawl, and the requirement to exclude critical areas from UGAs. The size and location of the UGAs are also constrained by the requirement to exclude resource lands from UGAs.

3. In sizing a UGA or amending a UGA, a county must explicitly "show its work," and make the work available to the public so the public can review and comment on the work and policy choices.

We strongly urge the county to review the existing urban growth areas with these requirements in mind. Enclosed with this letter is the article How the Growth Management Act Changed Annexation: Background and Current Issues which further describes the requirements for designating urban growth areas.

Review the existing "urban development nodes" to make sure they are consistent with the Growth Management Act and will be efficient to serve with public facilities and services. We understand that Kittitas County's "urban development nodes" are a type of limited area of more intense rural development (LAMIRD). The "LAMIRD provisions were added to GMA to allow the county to acknowledge pre-existing development, not as a prospective and ongoing rural development tool."

In designating this type of LAMIRD, the county must clearly identify the logical outer boundary of the area. The logical outer boundary is one of the rare circumstances where a county must show its work. This is so because the Growth Management Act establishes specific criteria that must met rather than just considered.

The logical outer boundary is delineated predominately by the "built environment" that existed on July 1, 1990, or the date when the county was first required or chose to fully
plan under the GMA.\textsuperscript{22} The “built environment” includes man-made structures located above and below the ground, such as existing buildings, sewer lines, and other urban level utilities or infrastructure.\textsuperscript{23} The extent of the infrastructure or the service area that existed in 1990 or the date when the county was first required or chose to fully plan under the GMA may be used to set the logical outer boundary.\textsuperscript{24} Vested developments not built in 1990 or the date the county was required or chose to fully plan under the GMA cannot be used to determine the built environment.\textsuperscript{25} Subdivided or platted land that was not developed in 1990 or the date the county was required or chose to fully plan under the GMA cannot be used to define the built environment.\textsuperscript{26}

We urge the county to review the existing “urban development nodes” with these requirements in mind. This is one of the provisions in Amendment File No. 06-10.

\textit{Densities Greater than One Dwelling Unit per Five Acres are Removed from the Rural Areas and Resource Lands Except for “Urban Development Nodes”}

The Growth Management Act (GMA) created three state agencies to interpret the GMA and to hear appeals alleging that cities, counties, or state agencies are in violation of the GMA. Kittitas County is in the jurisdiction of the Eastern Washington Growth Management Hearings Board.

The Eastern Washington Growth Management Hearings Board, in defining what is “urban growth” and what is allowable rural development, has held that in rural areas, densities no greater than one housing unit per five-acres is allowed.\textsuperscript{27} This decision is based on the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{22} RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d)(iv).
\item \textsuperscript{25} \textit{City of Anacortes v. Skagit County}, WWGMHB Case No. 00-2-0049c Final Decision and Order (C/I Development Issues) p. *18 (February 6, 2001).
\item \textsuperscript{26} \textit{Vince Panesko et al. v. Lewis County}, WWGMHB Case No. 00-2-0031c, Eugene Butler, et al. v. Lewis County, WWGMHB Case No. 99-2-0027c, & Daniel Smith, et al., Vince Panesko, and John T. Mudge v. Lewis County, WWGMHB No. 98-2-0011c Final Decision and Order & Compliance Order, 2001 WL 246707 pp. *26 – 28 (March 5, 2001). A plat is a formal map approved by and recorded with the county that subdivides land. “Plat” or “platted” is sometimes used interchangeably with “subdivision” or “subdivided.”
\item \textsuperscript{27} \textit{City of Moses Lake v. Grant County}, EWGMHB Case No. 99-1-0016 Final Decision and Order pp. *5 – 6 of 11 (May 23, 2000). See also Diehl v. Mason County, 94 Wn. App. 645, 655-57, 972 P.2d 543, 547-49 (1999) (Residential densities of one housing unit, or more, per 2.5 acres “would allow for urban-like development” and are prohibited outside urban growth areas including in rural areas).
\end{itemize}
requirements of the Growth Management Act (GMA). The GMA prohibits urban growth outside the urban growth area, including rural areas.28 The GMA, in RCW 36.70A.030(17), defines urban growth as “... growth that makes intensive use of land for the location of buildings, structures, and impermeable surfaces to such a degree as to be incompatible with the primary use of land for the production of food, other agricultural products, or fiber, or the extraction of mineral resources, rural uses, rural development, and natural resource lands designated pursuant to RCW 36.70A.170. ... When allowed to spread over wide areas, urban growth typically requires urban governmental services.”

The Census of Agriculture shows that the average Kittitas County farm in 2002 totaled 248 acres.29 The smallest category of farm reported by the Census of Agriculture is farms from one to nine acres in size. In Kittitas County in 2002 there were 120 farms in that category and they consisted of 682 acres.30 So the average size of these farms was 5.86 acres. Since a little over five acres is the smallest size that supports agriculture and lots that are too small to support agriculture are defined as urban growth, this data certainly supports the Eastern Board’s holding on rural densities.

Rural densities of one dwelling unit per three acres or greater will lead to many adverse impacts on Kittitas County land owners, residents, and taxpayers. These densities lead to what is called rural sprawl.

In Rural Sprawl: Problems and Policies in Eight Rural Counties, Rick Reeder, Dennis Brown, and Kevin McReynolds of the United States Department of Agriculture’s Economic Research Service described the results of a telephone survey of eight fast growing rural counties.31 With its 1996 to 2006 population growth rate of 21.43 percent, Kittitas County is within the range of the counties studied.32 Among the problems the study found were school crowding, traffic congestion, and water supply problems, and pollution from septic tanks.33 Most of the eight counties also reported problems maintaining public services including police and fire services.34 Interestingly, Washington and Florida counties appeared to be in the best shape to manage public services, due in part to both states’ growth management

---

30 Id.
31 Available from http://www.ers.usda.gov/briefing/Infrastructure/ReederRuralsprawl.pdf and included on the data CD enclosed with the paper original of this letter.
32 Rick Reeder, Dennis Brown, and Kevin McReynolds, Rural Sprawl: Problems and Policies in Eight Rural Counties p. 200, Table 1 (United States Department of Agriculture’s Economic Research Service).
33 Id. at 201 to 202.
34 Id. at 202.
laws.\textsuperscript{35} The authors also concluded that Mason County's Growth Management Act required zoning regulations had "significantly contained rural sprawl."\textsuperscript{36} Outside of limited areas of more intense rural development and historic towns, Mason County's highest density rural zone is one dwelling unit per five acres.\textsuperscript{37}

Professor Tom Daniels also wrote about the adverse impacts of rural sprawl in a paper entitled \textit{What to Do About Rural Sprawl}?\textsuperscript{38} Professor Daniels wrote:

Rural sprawl creates a host of planning challenges. Rural residential sprawl usually occurs away from existing central sewer and water. Homeowners rely on on-site septic systems and on wells for water. Often, these systems are not properly sited or not properly maintained. For example, a 1998 study in Indiana reported that between 25 and 70 percent of the on-site septic systems in the state were failing.

When septic systems fail in large numbers, sewer and water lines must be extended into the countryside, often a mile or more. Public sewer is priced according to average cost pricing. This means that when sewer lines are extended, there is a strong incentive to encourage additional hook-ups along the line. So when a sewer line is extended a mile or more, development pressure increases along the line. This usually results in a sprawling pattern, like a hub and spoke from a village to the countryside.

The spread-out rural residents are completely auto-dependent and are often long-range commuters. This puts greater demands on existing roads and increases the demand for more and better roads. The greater traffic also results in the burning of more fossil fuels, producing more air pollution.

Rural residents also have added to the national trend of Americans consuming more land per person for a residence. The demand for 2- to 10-acre house lots has driven up land prices in rural fringe areas beyond what a farmer or forester can afford to pay. Moreover, as land prices rise, farmers and foresters are more likely to sell their land for house lots. This in turn causes a greater fragmenting of the land base, making it more difficult for remaining farmers.

\textsuperscript{35} Id.
\textsuperscript{36} Id. at 204.
\textsuperscript{38} Available at http://www.mrsc.org/Subjects/Planning/rural/daniels.aspx and enclosed with this letter.
and foresters to assemble land to rent. Rented land is especially important for commercial farming. Nationwide, about 40 percent of farmland is rented.

Newcomers to the countryside often have little understanding of the business of farming or forestry. The conflicts between farmers and non-farm neighbors are well-known. Neighbors typically complain about farm odors, noise, dust, crop sprays, and slow moving farm machinery on local roads. Farmers point to crop theft, vandalism, trash dumping, and dogs and children trespassing and harassing livestock. In forested areas, the increase in residents bring a greater likelihood of fire. In short, farming and forestry are industrial uses. They should be kept as separate as possible from rural residential development.39

Another adverse effect of dense rural development is adverse impacts on streams and wetlands. In addition, the Rural Element of the Comprehensive Plan is required to protect “critical areas, as provided in RCW 36.70A.060, and surface water and ground water resources...”40 Critical areas include wetlands and streams.41

In a recent review of these studies, Schueler []concludes that “this research, conducted in many geographical areas, concentrating on many different variables, and employing widely different methods, has yielded a surprisingly similar conclusion – stream degradation occurs at relatively low levels of imperviousness (10-20%)” []. Recent studies also suggest that this threshold applies to wetland health. Hicks [] found a well-defined inverse relationship between freshwater wetland habitat quality and impervious surface area, with wetlands suffering impairment once the imperviousness of their local drainage basin exceeded 10%.42

Densities of one housing unit per acre have 13 percent of the lot in impervious surfaces.43 Three to five acre lots have impervious surfaces of 8.3 percent.44 Five acre lots have impervious surfaces of 5.4 percent.45

40 RCW 36.70A.070(5)(c)(iv).
41 RCW 36.70A.030(5).
So, impervious surfaces above ten percent adversely affect streams and wetlands. Over the long-term, a five acre rural density is the highest density that can effectively maintain a ten percent effective impervious surface maximum. This is especially true given that many subbasins will include urban growth areas with much higher percentages of impervious surfaces. Some rural uses, such as agricultural product processing plants, may also have higher impervious surfaces. Higher densities, such as one housing unit per three acres or one dwelling unit per acre, mean that impervious surfaces will exceed this percentage in Kittitas County, resulting in significant adverse environmental impacts and adverse impacts on surface water quality.

The State of Washington Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development (CTED) also recommends against this type of sprawling, low-density development. CTED recommends rural residential densities of one housing unit per five and 10 acres. For rural agricultural and forest uses outside of agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance, CTED recommends densities of one dwelling unit per 20 acres.⁴⁶

High rural densities, including densities of one dwelling unit per three acres and one dwelling unit per acre, have the following additional adverse impacts:

- These densities increase costs to taxpayers by allowing land development that will require services that are expensive to provide.⁴⁷ On average, rural residential development costs more than it generates in revenues.⁴⁸ In contrast, working farms and

---

⁴⁴ Id.
⁴⁵ Id.
⁴⁸ Roger Coupl, Donald M. McLeod, & David T. Taylor, *The Fiscal Impacts of Rural Residential Development: An Economic Analysis of the Cost of Community Services, Planning & Markets*, University of Southern California, Vol. 5, Number 1 (2002). Downloaded from http://www-pam.usc.edu/volume5/v51a3s1.html on June 9, 2006 and included in the data CD enclosed with the original of this letter in the Rural Sprawl Directory with the filename: Planning and Markets_Coupl, McLeod, and Taylor.pdf.
forests cost less in services than they generate in taxes. "For every dollar of revenue from farm and open land, 51 cents was required to cover associated services."\(^{49}\)

- Put drinking water supplies at risk by allowing high density development in areas that contribute to drinking water for county property owners, farmers, ranchers, residents, and businesses.\(^{50}\)

- Harm the character of Kittitas County by allowing inappropriately high density developments in rural areas.

- Increase traffic because more people drive alone and must drive longer distances to work and to meet the needs of their families.\(^{51}\) Sprawling places are likely to have more traffic fatalities per capita than more compact regions due to higher rates of vehicle use.

- Harms critical areas and other environmentally sensitive areas.\(^{52}\) Sprawl results in fish and wildlife habitat losses and habitat fragmentation, the separation of habitats by development.\(^{53}\) Sprawl's dispersed development pattern leads to the degradation of water quality by increasing runoff volume, altering regular stream flow and watershed hydrology, reducing groundwater recharge, and increasing stream sedimentation.\(^{54}\)

It is important to have a maximum density of one dwelling unit per five acres in the rural areas outside of properly designated "urban development nodes" in order to maintain the rural character of Kittitas County, to protect drinking water supplies for both urban and rural residents and farmers and ranchers, to protect water quality, and to protect rural residents.

We understand that the county is concerned that property owners not bite off more than they can chew as to the size of their lots. It would be unfortunate if property owners have lots so large they cannot appropriately manage them. The solution to this problem is well crafted clustering provisions that maintain a variety of rural densities but allows smaller lots. The balance of the property would then be permanently maintained in forest, pastures, and habitat. Well done clusters should be screened and buffered from roads and nearby


\(^{51}\) *The Costs of Sprawl—Revisited* pp. 62 – 63.


\(^{53}\) *Id.*

\(^{54}\) *Id.*
uses and maintain the connected open spaces characteristic of rural Kittitas County. More information on measures to provide for high quality cluster subdivisions can be found in the report *Planning for Sustainable Rural Areas* enclosed with this letter.

**Why We Support the Amendments**

- These amendments will save taxpayers money. As we saw above, rural residential developments cost more to serve with public services than these developments pay in taxes. While working farms and forests generate more taxes than they do service demands.

- These amendments will protect drinking water supplies by limiting high density development in areas that contribute to drinking and irrigation water for county property owners, farmers, ranchers, residents, and businesses.

- These amendments will reduce traffic caused by large rural subdivisions that require people to drive long distances to work and to meet the needs of their families.

- These amendments will protect the county’s economy by helping to maintain working farms and forests. These amendments will also protect the landscapes that bring tourists and businesses and employees seeking a high quality of life to Kittitas County.

Our amendment is a comprehensive revision to the Kittitas County Comprehensive Plan. Please consider the amendment and these comments as part of the public hearings on the existing comprehensive plan and development regulations that you are having on Wednesday and Thursday of this week.

**Recommend denial of comprehensive plan amendments that redesignate working forests. Amendment File Nos. 06-02, 06-18, and 06-19**

Kittitas County has long been home to the forest products industry. Lumber and wood products manufacturing jobs continue to be the sixth highest paid in the county.\(^{55}\)

To protect the land base for this important industry, the Growth Management Act requires counties to designate and conserve forest land of long-term commercial significance.\(^{56}\) There are three key criteria for designating forest land of long-term commercial significance:

1. The land is “not already characterized by urban growth ...”\(^{57}\)

---


\(^{56}\) RCW 36.70A.060(1)(a) & RCW 36.70A.170(1)(b).

\(^{57}\) RCW 36.70A.170(1)(b).
2. "The land is primarily devoted to growing trees for long-term commercial timber production on land that can be economically and practically managed for such production, including Christmas trees subject to the excise tax imposed under RCW 84.33.100 through 84.33.140."\(^58\) This is principally a function of the land's suitability for growing trees. The Washington State Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development recommends that "counties and cities should use the private forest land grades of the" Washington State Department of Revenue, which are found in WAC 458-40-530.\(^59\)

3. In determining whether the land that can be economically and practically managed for long-term commercial timber production "the following factors shall be considered: (a) The proximity of the land to urban, suburban, and rural settlements; (b) surrounding parcel size and the compatibility and intensity of adjacent and nearby land uses; (c) long-term local economic conditions that affect the ability to manage for timber production; and (d) the availability of public facilities and services conducive to conversion of forest land to other uses."\(^60\)

Applying these criteria to proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments Numbers 06-02, 06-18, 06-19; our preliminary research shows that these properties still meet the criteria for forest land of long-term commercial significance. Please see the Kittitas County Assessor "Farm Residence Data Sheets" enclosed with the paper original of this letter. We are also concerned that the amendments will greatly increase development capacity in areas poorly suited to the development, such as the Teanaway. The Teanaway is one of Kittitas County’s treasures and we urge you to protect the area from overdevelopment.

We understand that some argue that the closing of the Yakima mill means that there is no longer a market for logs in central Washington. That is not the case. While the mill closure is a tragedy for the mill workers, suppliers, and community, it is part of a trend in Washington lumber mills. The number of mills has declined dramatically while the total capacity of the mills has increased substantially. Washington lumber milling capacity is now substantially greater than at any time since the 1960s and maybe even at any time in the state’s history. The mills are also converting from large log mills, to small diameter log mills. This increase in milling capacity, in both Western Washington and Eastern Washington, drives strong demand for logs from forest lands.\(^61\)

\(^58\) RCW 36.70A.030(8).
\(^59\) WAC 365-190-060.
\(^60\) RCW 36.70A.030(8).
\(^61\) See Dr. Bruce P. Glass, A Washington State sawmilling perspective of change in the log market (Washington State Department of Natural Resources (PowerPoint Presentation September 27, 2004) available at: http://www.dnr.wa.gov/ldocs/o/e/reports/Glass%20JFFM%2004_files/frame.htm and excerpts enclosed with the original of this letter and the enclosed data CD.
We also strongly urge you to deny the comprehensive plan amendments and rezones that propose a re-designation from forest land of long-term commercial significance. These lands meet the criteria forest land of long-term commercial significance. The lands are also important to maintaining the forest products industry and its high paying jobs.

**Recommend denial of comprehensive plan amendments that redesignate working farms and ranches. Amendment File Nos. 06-01, 06-03, 06-04, 06-05, 06-06, 06-07, 06-09, 06-13, and 06-17**

Like forest products, farming and ranching have been mainstays of the Kittitas County economy. The most recent state economic analysis of Kittitas County summarized the contribution of the two sectors in this way:

> The natural resource based industries continue to provide important employment and remain a vital part of the local economy. Agriculture in the rich Kittitas Valley is thriving. Its employment accounted for 7 percent of all covered employment in 2000. The manufacturing sector is also driven by the local natural resource base industries. The highest manufacturing employment is found in food processing, followed by lumber and wood products. Manufacturing in Kittitas County employed 700 workers in 2000.\(^{62}\)

Like forest products, agriculture relies on its land base. Also like forest products there are three primary criteria for agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance. As the Supreme Court has recently held:

> ¶ 17 In sum, based on the plain language of the GMA and its interpretation in *Benarrow* I, we hold that agricultural land is land: (a) not already characterized by urban growth (b) that is primarily devoted to the commercial production of agricultural products enumerated in RCW 36.70A.030(2), including land in areas used or capable of being used for production based on land characteristics, and (c) that has long-term commercial significance for agricultural production, as indicated by soil, growing capacity, productivity, and whether it is near population areas or vulnerable to more intense uses. We further hold that counties may consider the development-related factors enumerated in WAC 365-190-050(1) in determining which lands have long-term commercial significance.\(^{63}\)

---


Our preliminary research shows that the properties proposed for comprehensive plan amendments and rezones from Commercial Agriculture and AG-20 continue to meet these criteria. We urge you to recommend denial of these comprehensive plan amendments and rezones.

*Recommend denial of comprehensive plan amendments that expand urban growth areas or urban commercial uses outside the urban growth area without a comprehensive analysis showing that the expansions are needed to accommodate the county’s adopted growth target. Amendment File Nos. 06-03, 06-04, and 06-13*

As we saw under our discussion of proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment 06-10, urban growth areas must be limited to the land needed to accommodate the Kittitas County’s adopted 20-year population target. The county must show its work, that is, the county must provide an analysis showing that an expansion is needed. We have not seen such an analysis so we urge you to recommend denial of these amendments until the need is clearly shown. In addition, the Supreme Court has concluded that agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance should generally not be included in the urban growth area.\(^{64}\) So we urge you not to include lands that qualify as agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance in the urban growth area.

*Recommend denial of comprehensive plan amendments that expand urban growth nodes without an analysis showing that they are within the 1990 built environment of the node. Amendment File Nos. 06-14, 06-15, and 06-16*

As to the “urban growth nodes,” as we also saw under our discussion of proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment 06-10, these are a type of LAMIRD and there boundaries must be based primarily on the 1990 built environment. Again, the county must show its work. Since neither the applicants nor the county have shown the expansions are within the logical outer boundary based primarily on the 1990 built environment, we recommend that you recommend denial of these amendments.

*Given the large size of the site specific amendments, an environmental impact statement [EIS] is required.*

The Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) requires that an environmental impact statement (EIS) shall be prepared for proposals for legislation and other non-exempt

actions having a probable significant, adverse impact. Given the 11.2 square miles of re-designations from commercial forest land to other uses, the re-designation of agricultural lands to other uses, the expansions to the urban growth areas, and the commercial expansions; the proposed site specific amendments to the comprehensive plan require an EIS. The probably adverse environmental impacts include substantially increased traffic on inadequate county roads, increased demand for fire and emergency services, increased demands for other public facilities and services, increased conflicts between forestry uses and adjacent residential uses, increased conflicts between farm practices and adjacent residential uses, a loss of public access for hunting and other uses, a loss of wildlife habitat, and increased demands for and competition for water and likely reduced water availability for senior water rights holders. There are likely others significant adverse environmental impacts as well. These probable significant adverse environmental impacts justify an environmental impact statement.

Thank you for considering our comments. If you would like more information please contact us.

Sincerely,

Kittitas County Conservation Coalition

Doug Kilgore
RIDGE

Tim Freminovich, AICP
Planning Director Futurewise
e-mail: tim@futurewise.org

Enclosures

---

65 RCW 43.21C.031(1).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Jefferson</th>
<th>King</th>
<th>Kitsap</th>
<th>Kittitas</th>
<th>Klickitat</th>
<th>Lewis</th>
<th>Lincoln</th>
<th>Mason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FARMS AND LAND IN FARMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number, 2002</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>1,548</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>1,402</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farms, 2002</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>1,817</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>1,058</td>
<td>1,151</td>
<td>1,137</td>
<td>1,324</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land in farms, 2002</td>
<td>12,473</td>
<td>41,769</td>
<td>16,812</td>
<td>28,996</td>
<td>23,718</td>
<td>20,460</td>
<td>11,530</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 acres, 2002</td>
<td>15,953</td>
<td>52,257</td>
<td>24,209</td>
<td>187,887</td>
<td>592,667</td>
<td>134,189</td>
<td>1,403,775</td>
<td>745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average size of farm, 2002</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres, 2002</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated market value of land and buildings 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farms, 2002</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>1,548</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>1,402</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000, 2002</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>1,817</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>1,058</td>
<td>1,151</td>
<td>1,137</td>
<td>1,324</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average per farm, 2002</td>
<td>3,986</td>
<td>9,997</td>
<td>3,746</td>
<td>2,638</td>
<td>1,558</td>
<td>2,722</td>
<td>5,121</td>
<td>3,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres, 2002</td>
<td>70,948</td>
<td>711,129</td>
<td>207,555</td>
<td>662,569</td>
<td>514,193</td>
<td>431,454</td>
<td>762,788</td>
<td>121,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average per acre, 2002</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>21,330</td>
<td>12,880</td>
<td>2,707</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>3,023</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>4,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000, 2002</td>
<td>7,788</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>6,583</td>
<td>1,558</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000, 2002</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000, 2002</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000, 2002</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000, 2002</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000, 2002</td>
<td>1,161,107</td>
<td>1,360,668</td>
<td>253,423</td>
<td>1,470,199</td>
<td>1,198,319</td>
<td>1,540,888</td>
<td>1,479,171</td>
<td>615,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate land area, acres, 2002</td>
<td>1,161,107</td>
<td>1,360,668</td>
<td>253,423</td>
<td>1,470,199</td>
<td>1,198,319</td>
<td>1,540,888</td>
<td>1,479,171</td>
<td>615,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion in farms, percent, 2002</td>
<td>1,161,107</td>
<td>1,360,668</td>
<td>253,423</td>
<td>1,470,199</td>
<td>1,198,319</td>
<td>1,540,888</td>
<td>1,479,171</td>
<td>615,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 size of farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 5 acres</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 49 acres</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 69 acres</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>3,142</td>
<td>1,359</td>
<td>3,635</td>
<td>3,143</td>
<td>7,886</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 to 99 acres</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3,117</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>6,181</td>
<td>4,148</td>
<td>9,258</td>
<td>2,163</td>
<td>1,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 to 139 acres</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140 to 179 acres</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180 to 219 acres</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220 to 259 acres</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260 to 499 acres</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 999 acres</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3,041</td>
<td>1,266</td>
<td>6,002</td>
<td>4,006</td>
<td>12,045</td>
<td>1,762</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 to 1,999 acres</td>
<td>1,182</td>
<td>4,045</td>
<td>1,503</td>
<td>7,091</td>
<td>5,402</td>
<td>13,360</td>
<td>2,017</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000 acres or more</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>3,041</td>
<td>1,266</td>
<td>6,002</td>
<td>4,006</td>
<td>12,045</td>
<td>1,762</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997 size of farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 5 acres</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 49 acres</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>3,499</td>
<td>1,216</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 69 acres</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 to 99 acres</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>3,148</td>
<td>1,015</td>
<td>2,852</td>
<td>2,947</td>
<td>4,147</td>
<td>1,743</td>
<td>1,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 to 1,999 acres</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000 acres or more</td>
<td>1,182</td>
<td>4,045</td>
<td>1,503</td>
<td>7,091</td>
<td>5,402</td>
<td>13,360</td>
<td>2,017</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND IN FARMS ACCORDING TO USE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cropland, 2002</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>1,507</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres, 2002</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>1,507</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvested cropland, 2002</td>
<td>8,442</td>
<td>27,100</td>
<td>6,716</td>
<td>89,048</td>
<td>187,715</td>
<td>90,864</td>
<td>7,519</td>
<td>6,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cropland used only for pasture or grazing, 2002</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See footnote(s) at end of table.

240 WASHINGTON

2002 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE - COUNTY DATA

USDA, National Agricultural Statistics Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Washington</th>
<th>Adams</th>
<th>Asotin</th>
<th>Benton</th>
<th>Chelan</th>
<th>Clark</th>
<th>Columbia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farms number, 2002</td>
<td>35,039</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1,313</td>
<td>1,193</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmland acres, 2002</td>
<td>15,318,093</td>
<td>1,067,693</td>
<td>280,301</td>
<td>607,683</td>
<td>112,003</td>
<td>22,724</td>
<td>76,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average size of farm</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>1,488</td>
<td>1,913</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated market value of land and buildings</td>
<td>35,069</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>1,314</td>
<td>1,195</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>1,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average per farm</td>
<td>31,016</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>1,481</td>
<td>2,471</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>1,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average per acre</td>
<td>224,418,486</td>
<td>761,273</td>
<td>49,200</td>
<td>1,529,388</td>
<td>302,972</td>
<td>15,814</td>
<td>57,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000,000 or $1,000,000</td>
<td>3,225</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate land area</td>
<td>42,888,197</td>
<td>1,231,275</td>
<td>408,620</td>
<td>1,089,978</td>
<td>1,869,675</td>
<td>1,113,429</td>
<td>402,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion in farms</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997 size of: farms</td>
<td>9,208</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260 to 499 acres</td>
<td>21,955</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2,886</td>
<td>1,833</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>2,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 999 acres</td>
<td>1,582</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1,609</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 to 2,999 acres</td>
<td>1,614</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3,032</td>
<td>1,268</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 acres or more</td>
<td>10,183,547</td>
<td>818,684</td>
<td>221,100</td>
<td>511,602</td>
<td>36,500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>203,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997 size of: farms</td>
<td>9,208</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260 to 499 acres</td>
<td>21,955</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2,886</td>
<td>1,833</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>2,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 999 acres</td>
<td>1,582</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1,609</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 to 2,999 acres</td>
<td>1,614</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3,032</td>
<td>1,268</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 acres or more</td>
<td>10,183,547</td>
<td>818,684</td>
<td>221,100</td>
<td>511,602</td>
<td>36,500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>203,735</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LAND IN FARMS ACCORDING TO USE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Washington</th>
<th>Adams</th>
<th>Asotin</th>
<th>Benton</th>
<th>Chelan</th>
<th>Clark</th>
<th>Columbia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cropland</td>
<td>28,184</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>1,314</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>1,147</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvested cropland</td>
<td>8,291,529</td>
<td>845,744</td>
<td>86,344</td>
<td>458,779</td>
<td>44,814</td>
<td>12,252</td>
<td>298,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cropland used only for pasture or grazing</td>
<td>7,130,249</td>
<td>776,289</td>
<td>14,262</td>
<td>14,870</td>
<td>1,307</td>
<td>4,722</td>
<td>26,221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See footnote(s) at end of table.
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Dr. Bruce P. Glass

of change in the log market
A Washington State sawmilling perspective
Mill equipment:
- Raw materials: Match log input feedstock and equipment-based: more cuts/pass
- Continuing drive for efficiencies:
  - Diminishing number of large-log sawmills
  - Expanding small-log capacity

Sawmill configuration
Calendar year ending December 1968 to 2002

Ownership source of logs consumed by Washington sawmills.
Log sourcing by ownership

Reduction of imbalanced base

Increasing seller diversity (not necessarily more sellers)

Potential for increasing rivalry among sellers (possible)

Expression as price taking behavior?
... especially when log prices are constrained by lumber prices

Log merchandising practices

Scale economies, value maximization

Incentive for out-of-state log sourcing

Capacity expansion & retooling

Competitive rivalry in log buying

... Look for sawmills to continue their drive for efficiencies...

What does it all mean w.r.t. the log market?
Section Report

By Ray Paoloella, ELUL, Section Chair-Elect

Thanks to everyone who participated in the Midyear Meeting and CLE at Rosario in May—in particular, Jennifer Dold and Tom Newlon who co-chaired the CLE program. The following is brief summary of upcoming ELUL Section events and activities:

Executive Committee Nominations. The elections for new members of the Section Executive Committee will be conducted in August by mail-in ballots. The nominees include:

For Chair-Elect:
Barbara Dykes, Snohomish County Prosecutor’s Office

For two open Executive Committee/Director positions:
Josh Brower, Mentor Law Group
Jennifer Dold, Bricklin Newman Dold
Josh Lipsky, Brown, Reavis & Manning
Tisha Pagalilauan, Preston, Gates & Ellis

Fall Quarterly. Please mark your calendars for October 21, 2004 for the fall quarterly meeting and CLE, to be held at the UW Law School. Adrienne Quinn, David Mears, and Michael Rossotto are coordinating the program for this event. Details will be forthcoming.
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Editor’s Message

By Wayt T. (Tim) Watterson, Newsletter Editor

This issue of the Newsletter is the annual summer issue based principally on written materials from presentations at the Environmental and Land Use Law Section Mid-Year CLE at Rosario on Orcas Island. Two CLE sessions are represented in the Newsletter as symposiums composed of independent articles by the session presenters adapted from their written materials and presentations. The first symposium includes two articles on forestry law in Washington, consisting of a brief background on the regulation of forest practices and discussions of current issues in forestry regulation from two differing perspectives. The second symposium includes three articles on municipal annexation issues in the aftermath of the Grant County Fire Protection District No. 5 v. City of Moses Lake decision by the Washington Supreme Court, addressing the role of the Growth Management Act and the provision of municipal services in urban growth areas. The final article in this issue summarizes recent court decisions on procedural aspects of litigation under the Land Use Petition Act. As always, responses from readers on any Newsletter content are welcomed and encouraged.

As we have announced previously in this column, we are looking for additional members for the Newsletter editorial board. The editorial board is responsible for producing articles and other contributions for publication in the Newsletter—either by authoring articles or updates or by soliciting others to author contributions. The editorial board also acts as a forum to determine what topics may be timely for articles and whether article proposals should be published. Anyone who is interested in joining the editorial board is encouraged to contact either me or another member of the current editorial board, as listed elsewhere in this Newsletter.

The editorial board will soon be developing the content for the next issue of the Newsletter. Anyone who would like to contribute an article for the next issue or any future issue, or who has questions or suggestions regarding the Newsletter, its policies, or the board, should contact me. Proposals for the next issue should be communicated as soon as possible. Thank you for your interest in the Newsletter.
Symposium
Municipal Annexations Under the GMA and Grant County Reconsidered

How the Growth Management Act Changed Annexation: Background and Current Issues

By Tim Trohimovich, 1000 Friends of Washington

I. Background
The Growth Management Act ("GMA"), which was adopted 14 years ago, has changed the process of annexation of land into cities in three key ways. First, the GMA requires that all counties planning under RCW §36.70A.040, the "fully planning counties," must designate urban growth areas ("UGAs") and prohibits any annexation of land located outside of UGAs. Second, the GMA established the policy that UGAs would ultimately become parts of cities, putting a premium on annexation. This policy is sometimes referred to as the "transformation of governance." Third, cities and counties are required to prepare capital facility plans for UGAs. Each topic will be examined in turn.

A. Designation and Review of Urban Growth Areas
Counties fully planning under GMA are required to designate urban growth areas, sometimes referred to as urban growth boundaries, in their comprehensive plans.2 UGAs are the lands designated in the county comprehensive plans to accommodate urban growth.3 Under the GMA, urban growth shall be encouraged within UGAs and is prohibited outside of UGAs.4

UGAs are particularly relevant now for two reasons. First, annexations outside UGAs are prohibited.5 Second, UGAs in most jurisdictions are nearly ten years old, and so the ten-year reviews required by the GMA are approaching.

1. Sizing UGAs
The GMA imposes three key requirements on local governments for sizing UGAs and amendments to UGAs: First, the size of the UGA, or amendment, shall be based on the state Office of Financial Management's ("OFM's") official 20-year growth management population forecast for a county. The county, with the cities in the county, chooses a population target within the OFM range. This target cannot be lower than the low end of the OFM range or higher than the high end. The UGA is then sized to accommodate that population projection and the employment, retail, public, and semi-public uses needed to accommodate the selected population target.6 UGAs are also required to include open space corridors to link up critical areas, open spaces, and parks.7 Second, a "reasonable market supply factor" may be included in sizing the UGA.8 The market supply factor is the percentage of land added beyond that needed to accommodate the OFM projection chosen by the county and cities. The market factor cannot exceed 25 percent unless several factors are met, including local circumstances.9 The Growth Management Hearings Boards ("GMHBs" or "Boards") closely review market factors above 25 percent.10
With records that clearly justified them, industrial market factors of 50 percent have been upheld in some areas, but not in other areas where the record did not justify the larger market factor.11 A market factor is not required.12

In addition to upholding market factors, the Eastern Washington GMHB has sustained including additional land in the UGA "required to realize a jurisdiction's 'vision of urban development' that can be realized over the next twenty years."13 This vision is constrained by a community's ability to provide adequate public facilities and services without decreasing service levels below locally established minimum standards, the goal of discouraging sprawl, and the requirement to exclude critical areas from UGAs.14 It is also constrained by the requirement to exclude resource lands from UGAs.15
Third, in sizing a UGA or amending a UGA, courts and the Boards have required that a county must explicitly "show its work," and make the work available to the public so the public can review and comment on the work and policy choices.16

a. OFM Growth Management Forecasts

The OFM is required to prepare a set of 20-year population projections for counties every five years or when the data from the decennial U.S. Census is available, whichever is later.17 OFM must review draft projections with cities and counties before OFM adopts the projections.18 In addition to cities and counties, OFM also asks regional planning and transportation organizations to review the projections. Cities and counties can provide OFM with data the city or county thinks is relevant. OFM must consider and comment on the information before it finalizes and adopts the projections. If a city or county "believes that a projection will not accurately reflect actual population growth in a county, it may petition the office to revise the projection accordingly."19 No deadline is set for filing these petitions.

OFM is required to include "a reasonable range developed within the standard state high and low projection. The middle range shall represent the office's estimate of the most likely population projection for the county."20 In 2002, OFM published a new range of 20-year population forecasts for Washington State counties. Each county in cooperation with the cities in the county must choose a 20-year population projection from within that range and provide the areas and densities necessary to accommodate that projection.21 The allocation process may be coupled with a ten-year urban growth area review, although it can be a separate process. The population projections, methodology, and additional information can be found at OFM’s website: http://www.ofm.wa.gov/pop/gma/index.htm.

In early 2004, OFM took a look at how well its projections are tracking actual growth. OFM found that:

- One-third of the counties are tracking closely, within one percent, of their intermediate projection. This includes large counties like Clark, King, Snohomish, and Spokane—and small counties like Garfield, Lincoln, and Pacific.

- All but two counties, Franklin and Pend Oreille Counties, are tracking within the high and low projection range. Franklin County’s 2003 population estimate is 310 persons above their high projection series. Pend Oreille County’s 2003 population estimate is 14 persons less than their low projection.

- About 70 percent of the counties are tracking below their intermediate projection series. This largely reflects lower migration gains due to Washington’s flat economy. More counties may drop below their low growth expectations before there is an upturn in the state's economy.22

Local governments may petition OFM to modify the official projections, or may file a petition for review with one of three regional GMHBs requesting that the projections be adjusted.23 No appeals have been filed over the 2002 projections, perhaps because the wide population projection range gives counties a significant amount of discretion in selecting the population to plan for. As long as the choice is within the range and adequate opportunities for public comment are provided, this choice cannot be effectively challenged. OFM’s record in projecting populations may also play a role. Unlike appeals of comprehensive plans and development regulations which have a jurisdictional time limit of 60 days after a notice of adoption is published, requests for population projection adjustment can be filed at anytime.24

A request for an adjustment was filed for OFM’s first population projections. At that time the GMA directed OFM to make only one projection for each county rather than the range it now projects. Kitsap County requested that the projection be adjusted so that it was higher. After concluding the presumption of validity did not apply to OFM’s projections, the Central Puget Sound GMHB held that Kitsap County had not shown that its "proposed adjustment is supported by more credible assumptions and a more analytical methodology than the documented rationale that supports OFM’s projection." Consequently, the adjustment was denied.25

2. Locational Criteria for UGAs

The Growth Management Act also sets out locational requirements for including land within an UGA, and these apply to additions or amendments to UGAs as well. They are:

- All cities and towns must be included in a UGA.26 An urban growth area may include more than a single city.27

- If additional land is needed to accommodate the growth target, "[a]n urban growth area may include territory that is located outside of a city only if such territory already is characterized by urban growth whether or not the urban growth area includes a city, or is adjacent to territory already characterized by urban growth."28

- "However, this does not give counties the carte blanche permission to designate as UGAs all urbanized unincorporated lands, because to do so would violate two of the fundamental purposes that both UGAs and CPPs [County-wide Planning Policies] must serve: to achieve the transformation of local governance within the UGA such that cities are, in general, the primary providers of urban govern-
mental services and to achieve compact urban development. [City of] Tacoma [v. Pierce County, CPSGMHB No. 94-3-0001, Final Decision and Order (1994)] at 12."

- In a recent case, the Central Puget Sound Board held that land connected to a city by a highway and county road, but no private land for approximately 700 feet, was not "adjacent to land characterized by urban growth," and thus did not comply with the requirements of RCW §36.70A.110(1).30

- UGAs can also be located outside existing city limits if the detailed requirements for a new fully contained community are met.31 These include reserving part of the OFM population projection for the fully contained community and offsetting the urban growth area accordingly.32

- Lands with extensive critical areas and resource lands should be excluded from the urban growth area. "[T]he land speaks first. Only after a county's agricultural, forestry and mineral resource lands have been identified and actions taken to conserve them, and its critical areas, including aquifers, are identified and protected, is it then possible and appropriate to determine where, on the remaining land, urban growth should be directed pursuant to RCW §36.70A.110."33

"Critical areas' include the following areas and ecosystems: (a) Wetlands; (b) areas with a critical recharging effect on aquifers used for potable water; (c) fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas; (d) frequently flooded areas; and (e) geologically hazardous areas."34 Resource lands include agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance, forest lands of long-term commercial significance, and mineral lands of long-term commercial significance.35

There are other locational rules as well. For example, merely being adjacent "to urban services, such as utilities, or city limits' does not impose requirement that this territory be included within a UGA, unless existing cities cannot accommodate the additional projected growth and it is otherwise an appropriate location for such growth."36

3. Counties and Cities Must Consult on UGAs

Another requirement of the Growth Management Act is that counties must consult with cities on the UGAs.37 The county is to try to get the agreement of the city on the UGA and if an agreement cannot be reached, the county must justify the UGA in writing.38 Cities can object in writing to the Washington Department of Community Trade and Economic Development ("CTED").39 In appropriate circumstances, CTED shall attempt to resolve the conflict and including the use of mediation.40

If a city requests more discussion with a county over a UGA and a county does not respond, that is reversible error upon appeal. "While agreement is not mandatory, an attempt to agree is necessary. The Board finds the County's failure to enter into discussions with the City on the elimination of the City's UGA outside the City is clearly erroneous.41 While dates in RCW §36.70A.110(2) show that these consultation requirements apply the initial adoption of a UGA, I also think that the Growth Boards will apply these principles to the ten-year UGA review. After all RCW §36.70A.130(3) requires the participation of cities and counties in the ten-year UGA review.

4. Ten-Year UGA Reviews

The Growth Management Act, in RCW §36.70A.130(3), sets out the requirements for the ten-year UGA review. They are:

- "Each county that designates urban growth areas under RCW §36.70A.110 shall review, at least every ten years, its designated urban growth area or areas, and the densities permitted within both the incorporated and unincorporated portions of each urban growth area."

- "In conjunction with this review by the county, each city located within an urban growth area shall review the densities permitted within its boundaries, and the extent to which the urban growth occurring within the county has located within each city and the unincorporated portions of the urban growth areas."

- "The county comprehensive plan designating urban growth areas, and the densities permitted in the urban growth areas by the comprehensive plans of the county and each city located with the urban growth areas, shall be revised to accommodate the urban growth projected to occur in the county for the succeeding twenty-year period."

- "The review required by this subsection may be combined with the review and evaluation required by RCW §36.70A.215 [the so-called Buildable Lands analysis and reports for six large counties]."42 (Spacing added). Since UGA updates are on at least a ten-year update cycle and comprehensive plan and development regulation updates are on at least a seven-year update cycle, counties may choose whether to review their UGAs as part of their comprehensive plan and development regulation periodic updates.

If a city or county does not carry out its ten-year UGA review by the deadline, the review can be enforced by the Boards through a failure-to-adopt appeal.43 Since the first ten-year updates are just now starting to come due, there are no reported cases before the Boards or the courts, except a couple of decisions finding that the ten-year review was not yet due.
While UGAs must comply with these requirements for establishing UGAs, cities and counties have considerable discretion in their comprehensive plans to make many choices about accommodating growth within UGAs.44

B. The Transformation of Governance within UGAs

One of the purposes of UGAs is “to achieve a transformation of local governance....”45 In the Growth Management Act “[t]he legislature recognizes that counties are regional governments within their boundaries, and cities are primary providers of urban governmental services within urban growth areas.”46 Consequently, “that which is urban should be municipal.”47

For this transformation to take place “a clear implication of this legislative direction is that incorporations and annexations must occur.”48 Transformation of governance should occur prior to urban development....Efficient phasing of infrastructure is the key and annexation should occur before urban infrastructure is extended.”49

County-wide planning policies (“CPPs”) and comprehensive plans are also to bring this transformation about.50 CPPs are adopted by counties in consultation with cities and guide planning in for both counties and cities. CPPs, comprehensive plans, and development regulations cannot place limitations on annexations within UGAs.51 The Growth Boards have held that UGA configurations that discourage annexation or the incorporation of cities violate the GMA.

The Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board (WWGMHB), Case No. 97-2-0060, Abenroth, et al. v. Skagit Co., held it is inappropriate to establish a non-municipal UGA in close proximity to a municipality with no plan for the transformation of governance. Annexation and incorporation of urban areas within UGAs are the means to achieve this transformation of local governance.52

In addition to encouraging the annexation of UGAs, the Growth Management Act also provides that “[i]n general, cities are the units of local government most appropriate to provide urban governmental services.”53 This does not mean that there is not a role for counties and special districts even in urban growth areas. According to the Central Puget Sound GMHB:

The transformation of local governance purpose will require the County and the cities to ultimately resolve the matter of which services will be provided by cities, which by the County and which by special districts, so that the cumulative effect is that cities are the primary providers of urban governmental services within the UGA. This can take many forms, and there is much discretion available to the County and cities collectively to craft a solution that is appropriate and unique to Pierce County. See Poulsbo, et al. v. Kitsap County, CPSGMHB Case No. 92-3-0009 (1993), Order Granting Kitsap’s Request for Reconsideration, at 12-13.54

One important tool for the transformation of governance is interlocal agreements. Washington’s Intergovernmental Cooperation Act authorizes public agencies enter into interlocal agreements to jointly exercise and enjoy any authority which they are otherwise granted.55 The Western Washington GMHB has required interlocal agreements to “ensure that annexation will be facilitated to enable the required efficient timing and phasing of urban infrastructure extension and urban development within municipal UGAs.”56 Skagit County interlocal agreements have also included the sharing of sales tax revenues from annexed land between cities and the counties. The county reports that while there have been some problems, overall these agreements have been successful.57

C. Capital Facility Planning for UGAs

The Growth Management, in RCW § 36.70A.070(3), requires comprehensive plans to include a capital facility plan. There are six key requirements:

- “An inventory of existing capital facilities owned by public entities, showing the locations and capacities of the capital facilities;”58
- “[A] forecast of the future needs for such capital facilities;”59
- “[T]he proposed locations and capacities of expanded or new capital facilities;”60
- “[A]t least a six-year plan that will finance such capital facilities within projected funding capacities and clearly identifies sources of public money for such purposes;”61
- “[A] requirement to reassess the land use element if probable funding falls short of meeting existing needs and to ensure that the land use element, capital facilities plan element, and financing plan within the capital facilities plan element are coordinated and consistent;”62
- “‘Park and recreation facilities shall be included in the capital facilities plan element.”63

(Spacing added.) The purpose for these planning requirements is to achieve the GMA public facilities and services goal: “Ensure that those public facilities and services necessary to support development shall be adequate to serve the development at the time the development is available for occupancy and use without decreasing current service levels below locally established minimum standards.”64 All three of the Growth Boards have read this goal to require that public facilities and services must be available to serve development as that development occurs or within a reasonable time.65
II. Current Annexation Issues

A. What Annexation Methods are Available?

The first Washington Supreme Court decision in *Grant County Fire Protection District No. 5 v. City of Moses Lake*, 145 Wn.2d 702 (2002), held that the most common method of annexation, the "property-owner-petition" method, was unconstitutional because it gave an "impermissible privilege to owners of highly valued land, and therefore violates article 1, section 12 of the Washington State Constitution." This generated much excitement in the tiny world of annexation practitioners. It also generated legislation establishing two new methods of annexation:

- A direct petition method that must be signed by both a majority of the property owners by value and a majority of the voters in the area to be annexed.

- A method that provides for interlocal agreements between counties and cities to annex land. The city can then adopt an ordinance to annex lands authorized by the interlocal agreement. The voters in the area can require a referendum on the annexation. This method is limited to the Buildable Lands counties and their cities: Clark, King, Kitsap, Skagit, Snohomish, and Thurston counties and the cities within those counties.

1000 Friends was a member of the coalition that worked on this legislation because of the central role of annexation to the Growth Management Act discussed above. Now that the Supreme Court on reconsideration in *Grant County* has held that the original property-owner-petition method of annexation did not violate privileges and immunities clause of the Washington Constitution, I suspect the property-owner-petition method will again become the most common method of annexation. This assumes, of course, that the second decision survives the most recent motion for reconsideration.

B. How to Encourage Cities to Annex Lands That Cost More Than They Raise in Taxes

One of the current hot issues is how to encourage cities to annex areas that cost more to serve than the areas generate in tax revenues. King County has been in the forefront of this question, concluding that the county can no longer afford to provide services to unincorporated UGAs. King County is proposing to pay cities to annex these areas. This is a solution that is probably not available to many other counties.

Cities and counties are facing significant fiscal distress. For example, I-747, passed by the voters in 2002, limits taxing districts with a population over 10,000 to annual regular property tax increases of the lesser of inflation or 101 percent of the highest levy in the three previous years (adjusted to account for new construction, improvements, and State-assessed property). Since inflation generally exceeds one percent a year, in real terms the value of the property taxes that cities and counties are able to collect declines each year.

As for local sales taxes, cities need to realize that sales taxes do not generate themselves. They are generated by residents, and cities need to be responsible for both the businesses that remit sales taxes and the residents that actually pay them. Perhaps the national move to shift sales taxes from the location of the businesses that remit them to the residents that pay them to make taxation of internet transactions easier will encourage more city annexations. Other solutions will be needed as well.

C. Races between Annexations and Growth Board Decisions on UGA Expansions

In several recent cases, the Central Puget Sound GMB was faced with the situation where a county expanded an urban growth area and then argued that the appeal of the UGA expansion was moot because the land had already been annexed by a city. In the first case, *Kitsap Citizens for Rural Preservation and Suquamish Tribe v. Kitsap County*, the Board wrote:

[T]he Board and the parties recognize the interplay between the GMA's UGA provisions and the statutes governing annexation. Counties must designate UGAs, pursuant to the GMA. RCW §36.70A.110(1). The Growth Boards have jurisdiction to determine compliance with the GMA, including GMA designations. RCW §36.70A.280(1). UGA designation enables city annexation, since cities are prohibited from annexing areas beyond designated UGAs. RCW §35.13.005 and §35A.14.005. BRB [Boundary Review Board] decisions must be consistent with provisions of the GMA, including the UGA provisions. RCW §36.93.157. This system is consis-
tent and coordinated and yields certainty in situations where UGAs have been found by the Board to comply with the Act, or where UGA designations have not been challenged. However, this system yields uncertainty where the UGA designation has been challenged, but not resolved as the annexation process proceeds. It is a situation that the Legislature has not, to date, addressed.\(^75\)

In *Kitsap Citizens*, the Board concluded that the UGA at issue was properly designated. In a second case, *McVittie v. Snohomish County (McVittie V)*, while quoting *Kitsap Citizens*, the Board held that the UGA designation process violated the Growth Management Act.

As the Central Puget Sound Board wrote in *Kitsap Citizens*, the Legislature needs to address this uncertainty. Several alternatives have been suggested. One is to prohibit approval of an annexation until the appeal period for an urban growth area has ended. If an appeal is filed, the annexation cannot be approved until the Growth Board decides the appeal or the appeal is settled. If a judicial appeal of the Board decision is filed, the annexation can proceed during that appeal if the Board upheld the urban growth area. Another alternative is to clarify that if the UGA expansion is found to be invalid, then any annexation of that area is also invalid. This alternative is also consistent with the Growth Board decisions. It should be coupled with a provision that also clarifies that development applications filed within an invalid UGA expansion cannot vest, that is, acquire a legal right to proceed under city development regulations.

D. UGA and Ten-Year Review Issues

As you probably gathered from the citations in the section on UGAs, there have been many appeals to the Growth Boards over the original UGA designations. The law is now pretty clear. Now that the ten-year review of UGAs is facing GMA jurisdictions, will they follow the law on UGAs as established by the GMA and the Boards, or will we see repeats of the first round of UGA appeals where repeated visits to the Boards were necessary before jurisdictions properly sized their UGAs? I think it is in everyone's best interest to follow the rules—no one benefits from multiple appeals.

1. The Role of Density in Accommodating the New OFM Population Projections

RCW §36.70A.130(3) specifically calls for amending densities as part of the ten-year update. If a ten-year UGA analysis shows that additional capacity is needed in the UGA, densities shall be revised. "The county comprehensive plan designating UGAs, and the densities permitted in the UGAs by the comprehensive plans of the county and each city located within the UGAs, shall be revised to accommodate the urban growth projected to occur in the county for the succeeding twenty-year period."\(^76\) (Emphasis added.) So local governments that need additional capacity to accommodate the new OFM projections should look to increasing densities as one solution.

2. Will UGAs Be Big Enough?

When UGAs were first adopted the primarily issue was whether they were too large. In many cases, the courts or boards held that the UGAs were too big, despite claims to the contrary.\(^77\) *Knapp v. Spokane County* was different. There the allegation was that the UGA was too small. After the Eastern Washington GMA held that Spokane County did not show its work, the county readopted its interim UGA.\(^78\) The Board then reviewed the county's efforts to comply with the GMA and held that the Spokane County interim UGA complied with the GMA.\(^79\)

Some have raised concerns that some of the new UGAs being considered are too small. While I have not seen evidence for this so far and have seen evidence to the contrary, RCW §36.70A.110(2) clearly requires that the UGA be large enough to accommodate the new 20-year population forecasts. Those UGAs that fail to do so will be at risk if they are appealed with the right record.

3. Rapid Growth is Projected—How Much Growth Will Counties and Cities Choose?

Like the 1980s and 1990s, the OFM population projections show Washington is likely to experience rapid population growth in the next several decades. The medium projection would add 796,540 new residents a decade, higher than the 734,316 net new residents added between 1980 and 1990. The adverse impacts of this level of growth led to the adoption of the Growth Management Act in 1990. The high projection would add 1,292,389 net new residents per decade, higher than the 1,117,452 net new residents added between 1990 and 2000, which was Washington’s fastest growth ever in terms of absolute population growth.

Counties, in consultation with their cities, can choose any population within the OFM projection range. Choosing the high end of the range implies a high level of growth and will likely require the expansion of the urban growth areas in the county. It also requires a high investment in the capital facilities and services needed to serve the population or the acceptance of a significant reduction in the level of services provided to existing residents and businesses. A lower number implies less growth and less investment in public facilities and services.

So far, counties and cities are choosing growth targets towards the middle of the OFM range. In part due to the high costs of providing adequate public facilities to large UGAs. It will be interesting to see if this trend continues.

Tim Trokimovich is a graduate of Willamette University and the Lewis & Clark College, Northwestern School of Law, cum laude. He is licensed to practice law in Washington. Tim is currently the Planning Director for 1000 Friends of Washington, a citizen's group that supports effective implementation of the Growth
Management Act, stopping sprawl, and sustainable development. Between 1993 and 2001, he was a Senior Planner and then Comprehensive Planning Manager for the City of Redmond Department of Planning and Community Development. He also spent 12 years working in various planning capacities in Grays Harbor County, Washington, and over a year with the Washington State Department of Ecology. He has been a professional planner in Washington State for over 20 years. He is a member of the American Institute of Certified Planners ("AICP"). At 1000 Friends, he focuses on land use and environmental policy studies, policy advocacy, land use law, and environmental law. He is a frequent speaker on land use and planning issues.

This paper consists of two sections. In the first section, it describes the changes to the annexation process brought about by the Growth Management Act ("GMA") when it was adopted 14 years ago. These changes include the designation of urban growth areas ("UGAs") outside of which land cannot be annexed to cities, a state policy of transferring governance over urban areas from counties to cities, and required capital facilities planning for urban growth areas. The second section identifies some current issues in annexation and gives some recommendations for their resolution. Reference is made in this report to many Growth Management Hearings Board decisions. Copies of the Boards' decisions are available at the website http://www.gmbd.wa.gov/index.html. The Boards also have excellent digests that summarize their decisions. The digests are also available at their website.
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See the following UGA locational criteria discussion.

Growth Management, Annexations and Special-Purpose Districts

By Brian K. Snure, Snure Regeimbal & Burke, P.L.L.C.

I. Introduction

We hold that the petition method of annexation gives an impermissible privilege to owners of highly valued land, and therefore violates Article I, Section 12 of the Washington State Constitution. With this simple pronouncement, the Washington State Supreme Court declared invalid the 57-year-old property-owner petition method of annexation commonly used by cities. The decision had an immediate, fundamental, and ultimately short lived, impact on the growth of cities in the State of Washington. In January 2004, the State Supreme Court, at the request of Governor Locke, the Association of Washington Cities and numerous other special-interest groups, reversed its decision, and once again a sense of calm satisfaction settled over the cities of Washington State.

The material that follows provides a brief summary of the Court's two decisions and then focuses on the more important issue: Why are special-purpose districts challenging city annexations, and what can be done to minimize the need for future annexations to be delayed by court actions? The Grant County decisions primarily focused on the constitutional rights of the citizens of Washington State to participate equally and fairly in the change of government by annexation. The case was filed, however, in response to the attempts of two cities to unilaterally annex areas without any concern for the impacts on the ability of two fire protection districts to continue to provide an adequate level of services to their constituents inside and outside of the proposed annexation areas.

As urban populations continue to grow in Washington, it becomes increasingly important for cities, counties, developers and special-purpose districts to work cooperatively. A cooperative approach will help to insure proper service levels in newly annexed areas and will insure that services outside of cities are not unreasonably jeopardized when cities annex limited areas of a special-purpose district.
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Introduction

One of the principle reasons for the adoption of Washington’s Growth Management Act was the loss of working farms, working forests, and salmon streams to sprawl.\(^1\) Washington residents were tired of seeing their beloved rural areas lost because cities and counties lacked the policy guidance and tools to protect them. The Growth Management Act requires

that rural areas be protected from inappropriate low-density sprawl.² And we are making progress. Between 1982 and 1997, each new resident in Washington used less newly developed land than all but six other states.³ We will need to continue this progress to have truly sustainable rural areas for us to pass on to our children and grandchildren.

The purpose of this summary is to assist those preparing and participating in the update of rural comprehensive plan elements and rural development regulations. It identifies the Washington State policy and requirements that apply to rural areas. While we have tried to carefully summarize the Growth Management Act provisions, they evolve as the legislature amends the Act and the Growth Management Hearing Boards (Growth Boards) and the courts continue to interpret the enactments. Consequently, this paper is not a substitute for legal research and advice.

This paper cites to provisions of the Growth Management Act, published court decisions, and published Growth Board decisions. The Growth Management Act, implementing procedural criteria, and the published decisions of the Washington State Supreme Court and Court of Appeals are all available at Legalwa.org: http://www.legalwa.org/. The published opinions of the Growth Management Hearings Boards and their excellent digests that summarize and index there opinions are available at: http://www.gmhb.wa.gov/ Unless otherwise noted or preceded by a Westlaw citation (which includes the year of the decision followed by the abbreviation “WL.” and a document reference number), all page numbers are taken from the version available at the Growth Boards’ websites.

Holly Stewart contributed to the LAMIRD section of this paper. Tim Trohimovich (AICP, JD) Futurewise Planning Director was lead author of the other parts of this report.

Definitions

Four key terms are used by the Growth Management Act (GMA) in setting rural policy. As the Growth Management Hearings Board's have held, an analysis of the rural provisions starts with the definitions adopted by the Legislature.⁴ This section includes the definitions for these key terms. The first definitions are derived from the GMA. The next three, rural character, rural development, and rural government services are direct quotes from the GMA.

² RCW 36.70A.070(5)(c)(iii).
³ Jeffrey D. Kline. Comparing States With and Without Growth Management Analysis Based on Indicators With Policy Implications Comment, 17 Land Use Policy 349, 354 (2000) (Washington used 0.48 acres of new developed land per new resident between 1982 and 1997. This was the seventh lowest rate of land conversion, only six states converted less land per new resident).
The rural area is the land located outside the urban growth area and outside resource lands.⁵ Resource lands are agricultural, forest, and mineral lands of long-time commercial significance.⁶

"Rural character" refers to the patterns of land use and development established by a county in the rural element of its comprehensive plan:
(a) In which open space, the natural landscape, and vegetation predominate over the built environment;
(b) That foster traditional rural lifestyles, rural-based economies, and opportunities to both live and work in rural areas;
(c) That provide visual landscapes that are traditionally found in rural areas and communities;
(d) That are compatible with the use of the land by wildlife and for fish and wildlife habitat;
(e) That reduce the inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling, low-density development;
(f) That generally do not require the extension of urban governmental services; and
(g) That are consistent with the protection of natural surface water flows and ground water and surface water recharge and discharge areas.⁷

"Rural development" refers to development outside the urban growth area and outside agricultural, forest, and mineral resource lands designated pursuant to RCW 36.70A.170. Rural development can consist of a variety of uses and residential densities, including clustered residential development, at levels that are consistent with the preservation of rural character and the requirements of the rural element. Rural development does not refer to agriculture or forestry activities that may be conducted in rural areas.⁸

"Rural governmental services" or "rural services" include those public services and public facilities historically and typically delivered at an intensity usually found in rural areas, and may include domestic water systems, fire and police protection services, transportation and public transit services, and other public utilities associated with rural development and normally not associated with urban areas.

---

⁶ Id. & RCW 36.70A.060(1).
⁷ RCW 36.70A.030(14).
⁸ RCW 36.70A.030(15).
Rural services do not include storm or sanitary sewers, except as otherwise authorized by RCW 36.70A.110(4).\(^9\)

The Growth Board’s have held that these definitions include requirements applicable to planning for rural areas.\(^10\) In interpreting these definitions, the Growth Boards have noted the following key points. Reading rural character and rural development definitions together, the Western Board wrote:

Development in the rural area can allow a variety of uses and residential densities including clusters. However, such uses and densities must be only at levels that are:

a. consistent with rural character (as defined in [RCW 36.70A.030](14)) preservation; AND

b. consistent with the requirements of [RCW 36.70A.070](5).\(^11\)

In reading rural governmental services definition, the Western Board also held that:

1. Storm and sanitary services are prohibited [outside of urban growth areas], except to alleviate an existing health or environmental hazard.

2. This definition [of rural governmental services] and the definition of urban services found in [RCW 36.70A.030](19) both include domestic water systems, fire and police protection, and transportation and public transit services. The distinguishing characteristic is that rural services must be “historically and typically delivered at an intensity usually found in rural areas.” Urban services are those that are provided “at an intensity historically and typically provided in cities, ....”\(^12\)

**Legislative Findings for Rural Lands**

With the adoption of the Growth Management Act in 1990, the Legislature found that uncoordinated and unplanned growth together with a lack of common goals posed “a threat to the environment, sustainable economic development, and the health, safety, and high quality of life enjoyed by residents of this state.”\(^13\) The legislature also found that it is in the public interest for citizens, cities and counties, and the private sector work together to prepare and update comprehensive land use plans, and that economic development programs should be shared with communities experiencing inadequate economic growth.\(^14\)

\(^9\) RCW 36.70A.030(16).


\(^11\) Id. at p. *11 (March 5, 2001) (emphasis in the original).

\(^12\) Id. at p. *12.

\(^13\) RCW 36.70A.010.

\(^14\) Id.
In 2002, the Legislature adopted another set of findings for rural lands. They are set out in full here:

The legislature finds that this chapter is intended to recognize the importance of rural lands and rural character to Washington's economy, its people, and its environment, while respecting regional differences. Rural lands and rural-based economies enhance the economic desirability of the state, help to preserve traditional economic activities, and contribute to the state's overall quality of life.

The legislature finds that to retain and enhance the job base in rural areas, rural counties must have flexibility to create opportunities for business development. Further, the legislature finds that rural counties must have the flexibility to retain existing businesses and allow them to expand. The legislature recognizes that not all business developments in rural counties require an urban level of services; and that many businesses in rural areas fit within the definition of rural character identified by the local planning unit.

Finally, the legislature finds that in defining its rural element under RCW 36.70A.070(5), a county should foster land use patterns and develop a local vision of rural character that will: Help preserve rural-based economies and traditional rural lifestyles; encourage the economic prosperity of rural residents; foster opportunities for small-scale, rural-based employment and self-employment; permit the operation of rural-based agricultural, commercial, recreational, and tourist businesses that are consistent with existing and planned land use patterns; be compatible with the use of the land by wildlife and for fish and wildlife habitat; foster the private stewardship of the land and preservation of open space; and enhance the rural sense of community and quality of life.\textsuperscript{15}

Findings help guide the interpretation and implementation of the GMA. They are not, however "substantive or even procedural requirement[s] of the" GMA and do not create "a specific local government duty for compliance apart from the subsequent goals and requirements of the Act."\textsuperscript{16}

The Rural Comprehensive Plan Element & Rural Development Regulations

The core GMA requirements for sustainable rural areas are for each county fully planning under the Growth Management Act to prepare and adopt a rural comprehensive plan

\textsuperscript{15} RCW 36.70A.011.
element and then development regulations to implement the rural element.\textsuperscript{17} This section will discuss the procedural and substantive requirements for the rural element and the development regulations that implement it.

The term "element" refers to topic areas that must be addressed in the comprehensive plan. "Development regulations" are "... controls placed on development or land use activities by a county or city, including, but not limited to, zoning ordinances, critical areas ordinances, shoreline master programs, official controls, planned unit development ordinances, subdivision ordinances, and binding site plan ordinances and" amendments.\textsuperscript{18} Incorporated cities and towns do not adopt rural elements because their jurisdiction does not include rural areas.\textsuperscript{19}

\textbf{County Discretion in Planning for Rural Areas}

In addressing the level of discretion that counties have in planning for rural areas, the Western Board has held that:

The Legislature recognized in [RCW 36.70A.070](5)(a) that local circumstances are an important consideration "in establishing patterns of rural densities and uses." This provision is consistent with the wide discretion allowed to local governments under the GMA. RCW 36.70A.3201.

However, that discretion was not intended by the Legislature to be unbridled. RCW 36.70A.3201 involves discretion that is "consistent" with the goals and requirements of the Act. [RCW 36.70A.070](5)(a) requires a county (through a written record) to "harmonize the goals" and "meet the requirements" of the GMA. The language of [RCW 36.70A.030](14), (15), and (16), emphasize that the patterns of uses and densities must be those which are "historical" and "typical" to rural areas. The Legislature did not say that whatever existed in a particular county on June 30, 1990, automatically became the existing rural character of that county. The Legislature has clearly said that the rural element must have parameters involving generalized historical and traditional "lifestyles" and "visual compatibility," as well as the predominance of the natural environment, compatibility with wildlife and fish, protection of waters and the reduction of "sprawling, low-density development."\textsuperscript{20}

\textsuperscript{17} RCW 36.70A.070(5), RCW 36.70A.040(3), \& RCW 36.70A.040(4).
\textsuperscript{18} RCW 36.70A.030(7).
\textsuperscript{19} RCW 36.70A.110(1).
\textsuperscript{20} Panesko, \textit{et al. v. Lewis County, et al.}, WWGMHB Case No. 98-2-0011c Final Decision and Order \& Compliance Order, 2001 WL 246707 p. *12 (March 5, 2001), accord the Washington Supreme Court in \textit{King County v. Cent. Puget Sound Growth Mgmt. Hearings Bd.}, 142 Wn.2d 543, 561, 14 P.3d 133, 142 (2000) ("Local governments have broad discretion in developing [comprehensive plans] and [development regulations] tailored to local circumstances."
\textit{Diehl v. Mason County}, 94 Wn. App. 645, 651, 872 P.2d 543 (1999). Local discretion is bounded, however, by the goals and requirements of the GMA.")
Requirements

- “Growth management act goals and local circumstances. Because circumstances vary from county to county, in establishing patterns of rural densities and uses, a county may consider local circumstances, but shall develop a written record explaining how the rural element harmonizes the planning goals in RCW 36.70A.020 and meets the requirements of this chapter.”\(^{21}\) While this written record could be a part of the rural element, what is required is an explanation of how the element meets the goals and complies with the GMA requirements not a listing of what has been done or just the rural element itself.\(^{22}\)

Rural Uses

- “The rural element shall permit rural development, forestry, and agriculture in rural areas.”\(^{23}\) Rural development is defined in the definitions section of this paper.

- “The rural element shall provide for a variety of rural ... uses and [] essential public facilities.”\(^{24}\) “Essential public facilities include those facilities that are typically difficult to site, such as airports, state education facilities and state or regional transportation facilities as defined in RCW 47.06.140, state and local correctional facilities, solid waste handling facilities, and in-patient facilities including substance abuse facilities, mental health facilities, group homes, and secure community transition facilities as defined in RCW 71.09.020.”\(^{25}\)

- “[P]roposed uses that meet the definition of urban growth will be prohibited in a rural area unless ... the use, by its very nature, is dependent upon being in a rural area and is compatible with the functional and visual character of rural uses in the immediate vicinity ....”\(^{26}\) Generally there are two categories of these uses:

  - Certain uses require rural sites, such as sawmills that mill timber from the rural area and resources lands.\(^{27}\)

  - “Likewise, localized commercial or public facility uses that serve a rural population or other activities in the rural area are dependent upon a rural location close to their constituencies.”\(^{28}\)

\(^{21}\) RCW 36.70A.070(5)(a).

\(^{22}\) Citizens for Good Governance, 1000 Friends of Washington, and City of Walla Walla v. Walla Walla County, Eastern Washington Growth Management Hearings Board (EWGMHB) Case No. 01-1-0015c & Case No. 01-1-0014cz Final Decision and Order p. *7 of 62 (May 1, 2002).

\(^{23}\) RCW 36.70A.070(5)(b).

\(^{24}\) RCW 36.70A.070(5)(b) & Vashon-Maury v. King County, Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board (CPSGMHB) Case No. 95-3-0008 Final Decision and Order p. *69 (October 23, 1995).

\(^{25}\) RCW 36.70A.200(1).


\(^{27}\) Id.
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Major industrial developments that meet the requirement of RCW 36.70A.365(2) may be approved outside an urban growth area, which includes the rural area. "Major industrial development" means a master planned location for a specific manufacturing, industrial, or commercial business that: (a) Requires a parcel of land so large that no suitable parcels are available within an urban growth area; or (b) is a natural resource-based industry requiring a location near agricultural land, forest land, or mineral resource land upon which it is dependent. The major industrial development shall not be for the purpose of retail commercial development or multitenant office parks. To establish a process for these developments, the county must consult with the cities in the county. Final approval of a major industrial development designates the site as an urban growth area.

In addition to the major industrial developments authorized by RCW 36.70A.365, many, but not all, of the counties fully planning under the GMA in consultation with the cities in the county may establish a process for designating up to two master planned locations for major industrial activity outside the urban growth area. The county must meet certain eligibility requirements and the locations must meet certain standards.

New or existing master planned resorts may also be allowed in rural areas if they meet certain standards. They are briefly described in a separate section below.

Parts of a town or district that has been designated a national historic landmark by the United States secretary of the interior under 16 U.S.C. § 461 et seq. "may include the types of uses that existed at times during its history and is not limited to those present at the time of the historic designation." This can include residential, commercial, industrial, tourist, and waterfront uses that were historically found in the town or district. These historic towns and districts may even constitute urban growth in the rural area. The county comprehensive plan must meet certain standards to use these provisions.

In areas used for more intense purposes, limited areas of more intense rural development (LAMIRDS) may be used to provide for these preexisting types of uses. LAMIRDS are more fully discussed in their own section below.

---

28 Id.
29 RCW 36.70A.365.
30 RCW 36.70A.365(1).
31 RCW 36.70A.365.
32 RCW 36.70A.365(3).
33 RCW 36.70A.367.
34 RCW 36.70A.360 & RCW 36.70A.362.
35 RCW 36.70A.520(2).
36 RCW 36.70A.520.
While rural development must be permitted in the rural area, urban growth is prohibited.37

RCW 36.70A.030(17) defines urban growth as "... growth that makes intensive use of land for the location of buildings, structures, and impermeable surfaces to such a degree as to be incompatible with the primary use of land for the production of food, other agricultural products, or fiber, or the extraction of mineral resources, rural uses, rural development, and natural resource lands designated pursuant to RCW 36.70A.170. A pattern of more intensive rural development, as provided in RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d), is not urban growth. When allowed to spread over wide areas, urban growth typically requires urban governmental services."

As was mentioned above, the Legislature has enacted limited exceptions to the rule urban growth is prohibited in the rural area for master planned resorts and historic towns and historic districts.

Rural Minimum Lot Sizes and Densities

In rural areas, no more than one housing unit per five-acres is allowed.38 Less dense development is allowed and mandated by the requirement for a variety of rural densities discussed below. For example, a county could choose not to have a density of one dwelling per five acres and only have lower densities.

In the Central Puget Sound region (King, Kitsap, Pierce, and Snohomish Counties), a pattern of ten acre lots is "clearly rural."39 "[A] new land use pattern that consists of between 5- and 10-acre lots is an appropriate rural use, provided that the number, location and configuration of lots does not constitute urban growth; does not present an undue threat to large scale natural resource lands; will not thwart the long-term flexibility to expand the UGA; and will not otherwise be inconsistent with the goals and requirements of the Act."40 "‘Land use pattern’ means the number, location and

configuration of parcels of a given size.\textsuperscript{41} "A land use pattern can be evident at a localized level (i.e., project and immediate vicinity) or an area-wide level (i.e., county-wide or a large portion of a county)."\textsuperscript{42}

- There are four exceptions to this rule.

- Ferry County is allowed a density of one housing unit per 2.5-acres in the rural area. "This Board finds, given circumstances unique to Ferry County, and in acceptance of the local decision making process, that 2.5 acre lots constitute rural development in Ferry County."\textsuperscript{43}

- Higher densities and smaller minimum lot sizes are allowed in limited areas of more intense rural development (LAMIRDs).

- Higher densities are allowed in master planned resorts.

- Parts of a town or district that has been designated a national historic landmark by the United States secretary of the interior under 16 U.S.C. § 461 \textit{et seq.} "may include urban densities if they reflect density patterns that existed at times during its history."\textsuperscript{44}

- Internal and attached accessory dwelling units (ADUs) may be allowed in rural areas without being counted towards the maximum allowed residential density. These are ADUs located inside or attached to an existing house or in an existing accessory building, such as a garage, located close to the house. Freestanding ADUs count towards and must comply with the maximum allowed density. Freestanding refers to separate dwelling units constructed on the same lot a primary dwelling.\textsuperscript{45} A county may need to analyze existing conditions, future projections, the need for ADUs, the impacts of future ADUs on public facilities and services, and the impacts of future ADUs on shorelines.

\textsuperscript{41} Sky Valley, et al., \textit{v.} Snohomish County, et al., CPSGMHB Consolidated Case No.: 95-3-0068c Final Decision and Order footnote 27, 1996 WL 734917 footnote 27 (March 12, 1996) citing Bremerton, at 50 \& Vashon-Maury, at 79.

\textsuperscript{42} Sky Valley, et al., \textit{v.} Snohomish County, CPSGMHB Case No. 95-3-0068c Order on Compliance Footnote 7 (October 2, 1997) citing Vashon-Maury, at 68 and Bremerton, Finding of Noncompliance and Determination of Invalidity in Bremerton and Order Dismissing Port Gamble, at 26.

\textsuperscript{43} Gary D. Woodmansee and Concerned Friends of Ferry County \textit{v.} Ferry County, EWGMHB Case No. 95-1-0010 Final Decision and Order p. *5 (May 13, 1996).

\textsuperscript{44} RCW 36.70A.520(2).

critical areas, and resource lands before adopting development regulations that authorize ADUs.\textsuperscript{46}

A variety of rural densities is required.\textsuperscript{47} A uniform one dwelling unit per five acre density in rural areas does not comply with the GMA and substantially interferes with GMA Goals 1, 2, 8, and 10.\textsuperscript{48} The requirement for a variety of rural densities helps achieve a number Growth Management Act goals and requirements and community goals. They include the following:

- A blend of one dwelling unit per five acre and lower rural densities can help achieve the rural character desired by the community.\textsuperscript{49}

- Lower rural densities can help conserve resource-based uses in the rural area such as forestry and farming.\textsuperscript{50} Larger minimum lot sizes can help maintain these uses and protect them from incompatible uses.

- Use lower rural densities to buffer natural resource lands, which are agriculture, forest, and mineral lands of long-term commercial significance.\textsuperscript{51}

- Use lower rural densities to reduce rural sprawl.\textsuperscript{52}

- One to five acre lots along urban growth area boundaries make the extension of public facilities, annexation, and future subdivision at urban densities difficult, hindering the logical expansion of urban growth areas if needed in the future.\textsuperscript{53} Use

\textsuperscript{46} Friends of the San Juans, Lynn Bahrych and Joe Symons, et al., v. San Juan County, WWGMHB Case No.: 03-2-0003c Corrected Final Decision and Order and Compliance Order p.*1, 2003 WL 1950153 p. *1 (April 17, 2003).


\textsuperscript{49} RCW 36.70A.070(5)[c].

\textsuperscript{50} Mänke Lumber Co., Inc. v. Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Bd., 113 Wn. App. 615, 625, 53 P.3d 1011, 1016 (2002). The comprehensive plan designations that complied with the Growth Management Act were the Interim Rural Forestry (IRF) designation with a density of one dwelling unit per 20 acres, the Urban Reserve designation with a density of one dwelling unit per 10 acres, the Rural Residential designation with a density of one dwelling unit per five acres, and the Rural Protection designation with a density of one dwelling unit per 10 acres. \textit{Id.}


\textsuperscript{53} City of Gig Harbor, et al. v. Pierce County, CPSGMHB Case No. 95-3-0016c Final Decision and Order, 1995 WL 903183 pp. *40 – 44 (October 31, 1995). In this case the board also held that even though there were more rural comprehensive plan designations, because the densities of several designations were the same there were effectively only two rural densities and this was not a variety of densities. The board gave as an example of compliance with the GMA’s variety of densities requirement a comprehensive plan with designations that had

Planning for Sustainable Rural Areas

\textbf {futurewise}

Building communities

Protecting the land
one dwelling unit per ten acres and lower rural densities to preserve opportunities for efficient future subdivision, the extension of public facilities, and annexation of land near the urban growth areas.

- To better match comprehensive plan designations and zoning to the actually conditions of rural areas. Some rural areas are very poorly suited to development either because of natural constraints such as a lack of water for domestic use or a lack of public services, such as fire fighting services. Lower rural densities can make development more sustainable.

- Protect rural areas with environmental attributes susceptible to damage from the development and surface and ground water resources. Ground water resources may be susceptible to pollution from septic tanks or reduced recharge due to impervious surfaces. Surface and ground water resources can be damaged due to a lack for forest cover or impervious surfaces. Lower rural densities can help protect these areas.

Clustering and Innovative Techniques in Rural Areas

- “In order to achieve a variety of rural densities and uses, counties may provide for clustering, density transfer, design guidelines, conservation easements, and other innovative techniques that will accommodate appropriate rural densities and uses that are not characterized by urban growth and that are consistent with rural character.”

- “Those innovative techniques, however, must involve ‘appropriate rural densities and uses’ that are not characterized by urban growth [RCW 36.70A.020][17] and that are ‘consistent with rural character’ [RCW 36.70A.020][14].”

- To meet these requirements, standards are required for clustering in rural areas. Clustering groups houses, or other development, on a limited portion of the site. This is typically the more developable or higher amenity part of the site. The residual parcel remains undeveloped or is used for rural uses. Required standards for clustering include:
  - Cluster densities, including any density bonuses, cannot exceed one dwelling unit per five acres.

---

54 RCW 36.70A.070(5)c(iv).
55 RCW 36.70A.070(5)b.
Cluster development regulations must include a limit on the maximum number of lots allowed on the land included in the cluster. This is needed to prevent urban growth in rural areas and to preclude demands for urban governmental services. Clusters that included more than eight housing units, even if authorized by special use review, violated the Growth Management Act based on the record before the board because it would not reduce low density sprawl and did not minimize and contain rural development as required by the Growth Management Act. This was because there was no prohibition on connections to public and private water and sewer lines and there were no requirements to limit development on the residual parcel, the land on which the housing units were not clustered.

“The Board can conceive of a well designed compact rural development containing a small number of homes that would not look urban in character, not require urban governmental services, nor have undue growth-inducing or adverse environmental impacts on surrounding properties. Such a rural development proposal could constitute ‘compact rural development’ rather than ‘urban growth.’ However, the [challenged regulations] do[] not have parameters to prevent development projects that constitute urban growth from occurring in rural areas. For example, there is no upper limit on the acreage or unit count that the [regulations] would permit to occur

also Diehl v. Mason County, 94 Wn. App. 645, 655, 972 P.2d 543, 548 (1999) “The GMA allows counties to use varying densities and cluster developments in rural areas, as long as the densities and clusters do not become urban and do not require the extension of urban services.” In the Durland decision, the Western Board upheld rural clustered development with a density of two dwelling units per acre. However, the clusters are only allowed if they provide affordable housing for very-low, low and moderate income levels for at least 50 years for ownership housing and 20 years for rental housing. The cluster subdivision was limited to maximum of eight housing units. No urban-level facilities or services are allowed. A maximum of 10 clusters containing a maximum of 100 units are allowed over a decade. Public or non-profit entities must own the site. The county limited the clusters to certain rural designations. Other clusters and developments are not allowed within 1200 feet. Rural development standards address water quality, quantity and septic issues. Michael Durland, et al., v. San Juan County, WWGMHB Case No. 00-2-0062c & Town of Friday Harbor, et al. v. San Juan County, WWGMHB Case No. No. 99-2-0010c Final Decision and Order and Compliance Order, 2001 WL 529884 p.*17 (May 7, 2001). The high housing costs and few urban growth areas in the San Juan Islands played an important role in this decision and it is an example of the flexibility and regional variation allowed under the Growth Management Act. Such clusters would not be allowed in the rural area of other counties.


Id.
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in rural areas, nor are there any parameters regarding the configuration, servicing or location of such development.  

Allowed Governmental Services

- "The rural element shall provide for ... rural governmental services needed to serve the permitted densities and uses."  

- The definition of rural government services is included in the definitions section.

- Urban governmental services, defined in RCW 36.70A.030(19), are generally not appropriate to be extended or expanded into the rural area. They may be allowed if the following criteria are met:
  
  1. Cities are the most appropriate providers of urban governmental services;
  2. It is generally not appropriate to extend or expand urban governmental services into rural areas;
  3. Limited occasions to extend or expand are allowed that are:
  4. Shown to be necessary to protect:
    a. basic public health and safety and
    b. the environment, but;
  5. Only when the urban governmental services are financially supportable at rural densities; and
  6. Only when extension or expansion does not allow urban development.

- LAMIRDs may include "... necessary public facilities and public services to serve the limited area ...." This may include sewers and, probably, piped storm water facilities. The "public services and public facilities [serving a LAMIRD] must be provided 'in a manner that does not permit low-density sprawl.'"

- RCW 36.70A.110(4) allows urban governmental services, such as water lines or sewer lines, to pass through a rural area to serve an urban growth area as long as the urban governmental services do not serve the rural area or other areas outside the urban

---

63 RCW 36.70A.070(5)(b).
64 RCW 36.70A.110(4).
66 RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d).
growth area. Similarly, urban governmental services may run from one urban growth area to another provided they do not serve land outside urban growth areas.

Measures to Protect Rural Character

- "The rural element shall include measures that apply to rural development and protect the rural character of the area, as established by the county, by:
  
  "(i) Containing or otherwise controlling rural development;
  "(ii) Assuring visual compatibility of rural development with the surrounding rural area;
  "(iii) Reducing the inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling, low-density development in the rural area;
  "(iv) Protecting critical areas, as provided in RCW 36.70A.060, and surface water and ground water resources; and
  "(v) Protecting against conflicts with the use of agricultural, forest, and mineral resource lands designated under RCW 36.70A.170."

The definition of rural character is included in the definitions section of this document.

Limited Areas of More Intense Rural Development (LAMIRDs)

Purposes
The "LAMIRD provisions were added to GMA to allow the county to acknowledge pre-existing development, not as a prospective and ongoing rural development tool." LAMIRDs are also one of several tools available to provide rural counties with the flexibility to attract and retain businesses, and the jobs associated with those businesses, to already developed areas while protecting the surrounding areas from unchecked development, especially low-density sprawl. However, as we have seen, there are better tools for resource based industries, businesses that serve the rural area, and some other economic development opportunities as well. See the sections above on rural uses.

---

70 Id.
71 RCW 36.70A.070(5)(c). Type 1 LAMIRDs do not have to comply with RCW 36.70A.070(5)(c)(ii) and RCW 36.70A.070(5)(c)(iii) in this quotation.
72 City of Anacortes v. Skagit County, WWGMHB Case No. 00-2-0049c Compliance Order p. *16 (January 31, 2002).
LAMIRDs are a Local Option
Counties may include LAMIRDs in their comprehensive plans and development regulations, but they are not required to do so.\textsuperscript{73} It is a local option. Nor are counties required to designate any particular part of the county, such as shorelines areas, as LAMIRDs.\textsuperscript{74} LAMIRDs were authorized by the 1997 amendments to the GMA that clarified and expanded the GMA’s policy towards rural areas.\textsuperscript{75}

Requirements for Designating LAMIRDs and Allowed Uses

Definition of LAMIRDs
A LAMIRD is a part of the rural area with existing land use patterns that are more concentrated than typically found in a rural area. This compact form of rural development is not considered urban growth under the GMA.\textsuperscript{76} LAMIRDs are not “to be the predominant pattern of future rural development.”\textsuperscript{77} Indeed, the Western Board held that Skagit County could not designate new LAMIRDs six years after the opportunity was provided by the adoption of RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d).\textsuperscript{78}

LAMIRDs are sometimes referred to as Areas of More Intense Rural Development (AMIRDs), Rural Areas of Intense Development (RAIDs), Rural Activity Centers (RACs), or similar terms. Some RACs are rural commercial areas authorized under other provisions of the GMA.

There are three types of LAMIRDs, each authorizing a different category of rural development. The types refer to the subparts in RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d) that authorizes them. A Type 1 LAMIRD, authorized by RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d)(i), designates existing areas of commercial, industrial, residential or mixed-use development. A Type 2 LAMIRD, authorized by RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d)(ii), allows small recreational and tourist businesses to develop and grow. Finally, a Type 3 LAMIRD, authorized by RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d)(iii),

\textsuperscript{74} RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d), Manke Lumber Co., Inc. v. Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Bd., 113 Wn. App. 615, 625 – 626, 53 P.3d 1011, 1016 (2002) “The Board and trial court properly found that the GMA does not require that the 1998 Plan allow[] for more intensive development along the shoreline. This provision clearly indicates a permissive, not mandatory posture. See RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d) (stating that the rural element of a county’s comprehensive plan "may allow for limited areas of more intensive rural development"). Given the wide discretion local governments have to develop their comprehensive plans, the County acted within its discretion.”
\textsuperscript{75} 1997 Session Laws, Chapter 429 § 7.
\textsuperscript{76} RCW 36.70A.030(17).
\textsuperscript{78} City of Anacortes v. Skagit County, WWGMHB Case No. 00-2-0049c Compliance Order p. *16 (January 31, 2002).
allows for the growth and new development of isolated cottage industries and small-scale businesses. Public facilities and services, such as water lines, necessary to serve the LAMIRD may be provided.\textsuperscript{79}

**Type 1 LAMIRDS and the Logical Outer Boundary Requirement**

A Type 1 LAMIRD can include infill, development, or redevelopment of existing commercial, industrial, residential or mixed-use areas, such as shoreline developments, villages, hamlets, rural activity centers, or crossroads development. Any development or redevelopment other than an industrial area or an industrial use within a mixed-use area or an industrial area under RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d)(i) must be principally designed to serve the existing and projected rural population.\textsuperscript{80} An industrial area or an industrial use within a mixed-use area or an industrial area under RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d)(i) is not required to be principally designed to serve the existing and projected rural population.\textsuperscript{81} Development and redevelopment may include changes in use from vacant land or a previously existing use so long as the new use conforms to the requirements of RCW 36.70A.070(5).\textsuperscript{82} Any development or redevelopment in terms of building size, scale, use, or intensity shall be consistent with the existing character of the LAMIRD.\textsuperscript{83} Unlike other forms of rural development, a Type 1 LAMIRD is not required to be visually compatible with the surrounding rural area. In order to preserve the character of the natural neighborhoods and communities, however, the county must limit the intensive development to areas where it already occurs. All (d)(i) LAMIRD uses (commercial, residential, or mixed-use) must be principally designed to serve the “existing and projected rural population.”\textsuperscript{84} The provisions of RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d)(i) that exempt industrial areas from the requirement of being principally designed to serve the existing and projected rural population do not apply to industrial uses within a mixed use LAMIRD.\textsuperscript{85}

In determining the location of a Type 1 LAMIRD, the county must clearly identify the logical outer boundary (sometimes called an LOB) of the area. The logical outer boundary is one of the rare circumstances where a county must show its work. This is so because the Growth Management Act establishes specific criteria that must met rather than just considered.\textsuperscript{86}

---

\textsuperscript{79} RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d).
\textsuperscript{80} RCW 36.70A.050(5)(d)(1)(B).
\textsuperscript{81} RCW 36.70A.050(5)(d)(1)(B).
\textsuperscript{82} RCW 36.70A.050(5)(d)(1)(C).
\textsuperscript{83} RCW 36.70A.050(5)(d)(1)(C).
\textsuperscript{85} Dawes v. Mason County, WWGMHB Case No. 96-2-0023 Order Denying Reconsideration p. *2 (January 17, 2001) [underlining in original].
The logical outer boundary is delineated predominately by the “built environment” that existed on July 1, 1990, or the date when the county was first required or chose to fully plan under the GMA. The “built environment” includes man-made structures located above and below the ground, such as existing buildings, sewer lines, and other urban level utilities or infrastructure. The extent of the infrastructure or the service area that existed in 1990 or the date when the county was first required or chose to fully plan under the GMA may be used to set the logical outer boundary. Vested developments not built in 1990 or the date the county was required or chose to fully plan under the GMA cannot be used to determine the built environment. Subdivided or platted land that was not developed in 1990 or the date the county was required or chose to fully plan under the GMA cannot be used to define the built environment. Existing zoning cannot be the sole criteria for determining the location of a LAMIRD, it can however be used as an exclusionary criteria. In order to minimize and contain the existing development, the county must draw the boundary closely around the built environment and be able to clearly justify its choices. Vacant land may be included in the LAMIRD and a county may make minor adjustments to a logical outer boundary to include undeveloped property. Such

---

87 RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d)(iv).
90 City of Anacortes v. Skagit County, WWGMHB Case No. 00-2-0049c Final Decision and Order (C/I Development Issues) p. *18 (February 6, 2001).
91 Vince Panesko et al. v. Lewis County, WWGMHB Case No. 00-2-0031c, Eugene Butler, et al. v. Lewis County, WWGMHB Case No. 99-2-0027c, & Daniel Smith, et al., Vince Panesko, and John T. Mudge v. Lewis County, WWGMHB No. 98-2-0011c Final Decision and Order & Compliance Order, 2001 WL 246707 pp. *26 – 28 (March 5, 2001). A plat is a formal map approved by and recorded with the county that subdivides land. "Plat" or "platted" is sometimes used interchangeably with "subdivision" or "subdivided."
93 Citizens for Good Governance, 1000 Friends of Washington, and City of Walla Walla v. Walla Walla County, Case No. 01-1-0015c & Case No. 01-1-0014cz Final Decision and Order, 2002 WL 32065594 *16 (May 1, 2002).

Planning for Sustainable Rural Areas
undeveloped property is to provide for infill.\textsuperscript{95} Infilling is allowed if it is "minimized' and 'contained' within a 'logical outer boundary.'\textsuperscript{96}

In addition to the man-made environment, a county must address the following factors in establishing the logical outer boundary: "(A) the need to preserve the character of existing natural neighborhoods and communities, (B) physical boundaries such as bodies of water, streets and highways, and land forms and contours, (C) the prevention of abnormally irregular boundaries, and (D) the ability to provide public facilities and public services in a manner that does not permit low-density sprawl."\textsuperscript{97} The county must avoid abnormally irregular boundaries, but this does not require that the boundary be drawn in a concentric circle or a squared-off block.\textsuperscript{98} The GMA does not mandate the use of any one physical feature, such as a water body or street, in setting the logical outer boundary.\textsuperscript{99} A county must take into account the requirement of including adequate public facilities and services that do not permit low density sprawl all within the logical outer boundary.\textsuperscript{100}

The boundaries of a Type 1 LAMIRD are permanent; the boundary cannot be expanded because this would be inconsistent with the goal of infilling existing areas of development.\textsuperscript{101} Demand or need for commercial or residential development does not permit the expansion of LAMIRDS beyond their logical outer boundaries.\textsuperscript{102} To do so would discourage commercial and residential development within urban growth areas as required by the GMA.\textsuperscript{103} In a later decision, the Western Board clarified that if LAMIRD boundaries are to be reevaluated, "that evaluation must be done on a one-time basis only to

\textsuperscript{95} Panesko v. Lewis County, WWGMHB Case 00-2-0031c Decision and Order p. *19 (March 5, 2001).
\textsuperscript{96} Bremerton et al. v. Kitsap County & Port Gamble, et al. v. Kitsap County, CPSGMHB Case No. 95- 3-0039c coordinated with Case No. 97-3-0024c Finding of Noncompliance and Determination of Invalidity in Bremerton and Order Dismissing Port Gamble p. *14 (September 8, 1997) & Panesko v. Lewis County, WWGMHB Case No. 00-2-0031c Final Decision and Order p.19 (March 5, 2001). Accord Citizens for Good Governance, 1000 Friends of Washington, and City of Walla Walla v. Walla Walla County, Case No. 01-1-0015c & Case No. 01-1-0014cz Final Decision and Order, 2002 WL 32065594 *17 (May 1, 2002).
\textsuperscript{97} RCW 36.70A.070[5][d][iv].
\textsuperscript{98} Vines v. Jefferson County, WWGMHB Case No. 98-2-0018 Final Decision and Order p.*3 (April 5, 1999).
\textsuperscript{100} Panesko v. Lewis County, WWGMHB Case No. 00-2-0031c Final Decision and Order p. *19 (May 5, 2001).
\textsuperscript{101} Olympic Environmental Council v. Jefferson County, WWGMHB Case No. 00-2-0019 Final Decision and Order p. *5 of 8 (November 22, 2000).
\textsuperscript{102} Olympic Environmental Council v. Jefferson County, WWGMHB Case No. 00-2-0019 Final Decision and Order p. *5 of 8 (November 22, 2000).
\textsuperscript{103} Id.
acknowledge historical reality under RCW 36.70A.020(5) and not to provide for” additional development.\footnote{People For A Liveable Community, Jim Lindsay, et al. v. Jefferson County, WWGMHB Case No. 03-2-0009 Order Granting County’s Motion For Reconsideration p. *1 (September 19, 2003).}

**Type 2 LAMIRDs**

A Type 2 LAMIRD may include new, intensified, and expanded development of small-scale recreational or tourist uses that rely on a rural location and setting.\footnote{RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d)(ii) & City of Anacortes v. Skagit County, WWGMHB Case No. 00-2-0049c Final Decision and Order (C/I Development Issues) p. *9 (February 6, 2001).} The development may also include commercial facilities that serve the recreational or tourist uses, but new residential developments are specifically excluded in this type of LAMIRD.\footnote{Id.} Unlike other LAMIRDS, small-scale recreational or tourist uses are not required to primarily serve or provide job opportunities for local residents.\footnote{Id.} Type 2 LAMIRDS cannot include new residential development.\footnote{Id.}

A Type 2 LAMIRD is meant to be a single lot or a combination of lots, not a wide area.\footnote{City of Anacortes v. Skagit County, WWGMHB Case No. 00-2-0049c Final Decision and Order (C/I Development Issues) p. *9 (February 6, 2001).} The public services and public facilities serving a Type 2 shall be limited to those necessary to serve the recreation or tourist use and shall be provided in a manner that does not permit low-density sprawl.\footnote{RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d)(ii).}

**Type 3 LAMIRDs**

A Type 3 LAMIRD can include the intensification of development on lots containing non-residential uses or the new development of isolated cottage industries and isolated small-scale businesses.\footnote{RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d)(ii) & City of Anacortes v. Skagit County, WWGMHB Case No. 00-2-0049c Final Decision and Order (C/I Development Issues) p. *9 (February 6, 2001).} “An isolated use, then, must be one that is set apart from others. The Legislature’s use of the term ‘isolated’ for both cottage industry and small-scale businesses demonstrates an unambiguous intention to ensure that any commercial uses established by the mechanism of a type (d)(iii) LAMIRD be set apart from other such uses.”\footnote{RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d)(iii).}

These businesses do not need to be designed to serve the rural population; however, they must provide job opportunities for rural residents.\textsuperscript{113} Both expansions of small-scale businesses and new small scale businesses shall conform to the rural character of the area as defined by the county according to RCW 36.70A.030(14).\textsuperscript{114} “Public services and public facilities shall be limited to those necessary to serve the isolated nonresidential use and shall be provided in a manner that does not permit low-density sprawl.”\textsuperscript{115}

Type 2 and Type 3 LAMIRDs must comply with the requirements of RCW 36.70A.070(5)(a), (b), and (c).\textsuperscript{116} For example, they are required to be visually compatible with the surrounding rural area and to limit the conversion of undeveloped land into low-density sprawl developments.\textsuperscript{117}

Requirements Applicable to All LAMIRDs
Major industrial developments and master-planned resorts cannot be authorized by a LAMIRD.\textsuperscript{118} The Central and Eastern Growth Boards have held that LAMIRDs cannot be located near an urban growth area.\textsuperscript{119} The Western Board prohibited a LAMIRD adjacent to an urban growth area where there was no evaluation of suitability of allowed urban style development, no evaluation of the need for urban services, and no evaluation of whether the area should have been included an urban growth area.\textsuperscript{120} In a different case, the Western Board upheld a LAMIRD adjacent to an urban growth area where there had been careful study of the LAMIRD and where the city opposed both urban growth area expansions and a non-municipal urban growth area for the area within the LAMIRD.\textsuperscript{121}

For those LAMIRDs that allow residential uses, the GMA “does not put an explicit limit on the absolute residential density permitted in LAMIRDs. The limit is unique to each LAMIRD

\textsuperscript{113} RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d)(iii).
\textsuperscript{114} RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d)(iii).
\textsuperscript{115} RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d)(iii).
\textsuperscript{116} City of Anacortes v. Skagit County, WWGMHB Case No. 00-2-0049c Final Decision and Order (C/I Development Issues) p. *9 (February 6, 2001).
\textsuperscript{117} RCW 36.70A.070(5)(c)(i) & (iii).
\textsuperscript{118} RCW 36.70A.070(5)(c) & City of Anacortes v. Skagit County, WWGMHB Case No. 00-2-0049c Final Decision and Order (C/I Development Issues) p. *8 (February 6, 2001).
\textsuperscript{119} City of Tacoma v. Pierce County, CPSGMHB Case No. 99-3-0023c, Final Decision and Order p. *8 (June 26, 2000) & Citizens for Good Governance, 1000 Friends of Washington, and City of Walla Walla v. City of Walla Walla County, Case No. 01-1-0015c & Case No. 01-1-0014cz Final Decision and Order pp. *27 – 28 of 62 (May 1, 2002).
\textsuperscript{120} City of Anacortes v. Skagit County, WWGMHB Case No. 00-2-0049c Final Decision and Order (C/I Development Issues) p. *18 (February 6, 2001)
\textsuperscript{121} People for A Liveable Community, Jim Lindsay, et al. v. Jefferson County, WWGMHB Case No. 03-2-0009c Final Decision and Order p. *11 (August 22, 2003).
and is established by the conditions that existed on July 1, 1990 [or the date the county chose or was required to plan under the GMA].”

“The GMA does not require an analysis of capital facilities for LAMIRD designation, nor does it require that population forecasts be used in establishing LAMIRDs.”

Master Planned Resorts (MPRs)

- Master planned resorts are described as “self-contained and fully integrated planned unit development[s], in a setting of significant natural amenities, with [a] primary focus on destination resort facilities consisting of short-term visitor accommodations associated with a range of developed on-site indoor or outdoor recreational facilities.”

- Master planned resorts can include either an existing resort or new resort if the standards in the GMA and local government policies and regulations are met. “An existing resort means a resort in existence on July 1, 1990, and developed, in whole or in part, as a significantly self-contained and integrated development that includes short-term visitor accommodations associated with a range of indoor and outdoor recreational facilities within the property boundaries in a setting of significant natural amenities.”

- The resort can provide a full range of capital facilities and services to serve resort. On-site capital facilities and services “shall be limited to meeting the needs of the master planned resort. Such facilities, utilities, and services may be provided to a master planned resort by outside service providers, including municipalities and special purpose districts, provided that all costs associated with service extensions and capacity increases directly attributable to the master planned resort are fully borne by the resort.”

- Master planned resorts are allowed to permit urban growth outside urban growth areas.

- “A master planned resort may include other residential uses within its boundaries, but only if the residential uses are integrated into and support the on-site recreational nature of the resort.”

---

124 RCW 36.70A.360[1].
125 RCW 36.70A.360 & RCW 36.70A.362.
126 RCW 36.70A.362.
127 RCW 36.70A.360[2].
128 RCW 36.70A.360[2].
130 RCW 36.70A.360[3].
The MountainStar Resort, now known as Suncadia, in Kittitas County is an example of an approved master planned resort.

Residential Data Sheet

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 14058
Map Number: 20-15-18040-0013
Situs: WELSON DAIRY RD RONALD
Legal: ACRES 22.12. CD. 5200-3; SEC. 18, TWP. 20, RGE. 15; PTN. S1/2 OF SEC. (PARCEL A, SURVEY B24/P10)

Ownership Information
Current Owner: P13 LLC
Address: 22915 WAX ORCHARD RD
City, State: VASHON WA
Zipcode: 98070-

Lot Information
Topography: SL
Amenities: VW/TOPO/ESMT
SITE/IMP/CLUB
Lot Width:
Lot Depth:
Street Access: PGY W
Utilities: NXXXX
Deeded Acres: 22.12

Physical Information
Type:
Quality:
Condition:
Arch Type:
Style: error
Exterior Wall: N/A
Floor Area:
Basement Area:
Basement Finish: 0
Bedrooms:

Baths:
Plumbing:
Fixtures:
Heat Type:
Roof Type:
Garage Type:
Garage Size:
Year Built / Age: /
Effective Age:
Remodel Date:
Remodel Type:

Miscellaneous Improvements
NO MISCELLANEOUS IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Filedate: 8/17/2006 5:00:00 PM

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/T-Resident.asp?pid=14058&key=23247
Parcel Comments
NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!

Filedate: 8/17/2006 5:00:00 PM
Property Summary

Parcel Information
- Parcel Number: 14058
- Map Number: 20-15-18040-0013
- Situs: NELSON DAIRY RD RONALD
- Legal: ACRES 22.12, CO. 6200-3; SEC. 18, TWP. 20, RGE. 15; PTN. S1/2 OF SEC. (PARCEL A, SURVEY B24/P10)

Ownership Information
- Current Owner: P13 LLC
- Address: 22815 WAX ORCHARD RD
- City, State: VASHON WA
- Zipcode: 98070

Assessment Data
- Tax District: 40
- Open Space: 0
- Open Space Date:
- Senior Exemption:
- Deeded Acres: 22.12
- Last Revaluation for Tax Year:

Market Value
- Land: 151,600
- Imp: 0
- Perm Crop: 0
- Total: 151,600

Taxable Value
- Land: 151,600
- Imp: 0
- Perm Crop: 0
- Total: 151,600

Sales History
- Date: 08-01-2006
- Book & Page: 2006-1893
- # Parcels: 5
  - Grantor: MILLER, FORREST ETUX
  - Grantee: P13 LLC
  - Price: 975,000
- Date: 07-01-1998
- Book & Page: 6091
- # Parcels: 5
  - Grantor: R & R PROPERTIES
  - Grantee: MILLER, FORREST ETUX
  - Price: 700,000
- Date: 07-01-1998
- Book & Page: 6090
- # Parcels: 5
  - Grantor: RICHARDSON, JOHN R F ETUX
  - Grantee: RICHARDSON, JOHN R F ETUX
- Date: 03-01-1998
- Book & Page: 5330
- # Parcels: 5
  - Grantor: RICHARDSON, JOHN R F ETUX
  - Grantee: RICHARDSON, JOHN R F ETUX

Building Permits
NO ACTIVE PERMITS!

5 Year Valuation Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Billed Owner</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Impr.</th>
<th>PermCrop Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>MILLER, FORREST ETUX</td>
<td>151,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>151,600</td>
<td>151,600</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>MILLER, FORREST ETUX</td>
<td>151,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>151,600</td>
<td>151,600</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>MILLER, FORREST ETUX</td>
<td>151,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>151,600</td>
<td>151,600</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>MILLER, FORREST ETUX</td>
<td>151,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>151,600</td>
<td>151,600</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>MILLER, FORREST ETUX</td>
<td>143,780</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>143,780</td>
<td>143,780</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>MILLER, FORREST ETUX</td>
<td>143,780</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>143,780</td>
<td>143,780</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/t-assessor.asp?pid=14058

8/18/2006
Parcel Comments
NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!

Filedate: 8/17/2006 5:00:00 PM
Property Summary (Appraisal Details)

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 14759
Map Number: 20-15-21040-0010
Situs: UNKNOWN ROSLYN
Legal: ACRES 24.74, CD. 6256-8; SEC. 21, TWP. 20, RGE. 15; PTN. E1/2 SE1/4 (LOT E4, B23/P188)

Ownership Information
Current Owner: CENTRAL CASCADES LAND CO INC
Address: PO BOX 171
City, State: ROSLYN WA
Zipcode: 98941

Assessment Data
Tax District: 43
Open Space: 0
Open Space Imp.: 0
Perm Crop: 0
Senior Exemption: 0
Deeded Acres: 24.74
Last Revaluation for Tax Year:

Market Value
Land: 199,490
Imp: 0
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 199,490

Taxable Value
Land: 199,490
Imp: 0
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 199,490

Sales History
Date | Book & Page | # Parcels | Granitor | Grantee | Price
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
08-31-2001 | 13307 | 17 | WESTERN ELITE INC SERVICES | CENTRAL CASCADES LAND CO INC | 3,515,200
12-26-2000 | 11794 | 35 | HERBRAND COMPANY THE | WESTERN ELITE INC SERVICES | 4,627,000
12-26-2000 | 11791 | 35 | PLUM CREEK LAND CO | HERBRAND COMPANY THE |

Building Permits
NO ACTIVE PERMITS!

5 Year Valuation Information

Year | Billed Owner | Land | Impr | Perm Crop Value | Total | Exempt | Taxable | Taxes
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
2006 | CENTRAL CASCADES LAND CO INC | 199,490 | 0 | 0 | 199,490 | 199,490 | View Taxes
2005 | CENTRAL CASCADES LAND CO INC | 199,490 | 0 | 0 | 199,490 | 199,490 | View Taxes
2004 | CENTRAL CASCADES LAND CO INC | 95,630 | 0 | 0 | 95,630 | 95,630 | View Taxes
2003 | CENTRAL CASCADES LAND CO INC | 95,630 | 0 | 0 | 95,630 | 95,630 | View Taxes
2002 | CENTRAL CASCADES LAND CO INC | 95,630 | 0 | 0 | 95,630 | 95,630 | View Taxes
2001 | CENTRAL CASCADES LAND CO INC | 95,630 | 0 | 0 | 95,630 | 95,630 | View Taxes

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxisiftableresult/t-assessor.asp?pid=14759
8/18/2006
NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!

Filedate: 8/17/2006 5:00:00 PM

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxisfepublic/t-assessor.asp?pid=783034

8/18/2006
## Property Summary

### Parcel Information
- **Parcel Number:** 783034
- **Map Number:** 20-15-21040-0001
- **Situs:** UNKNOWN ROSLYN
- **Legal:** ACRES 20,90, CD. 6256; SEC. 21, TWP. 20, RGE. 15, PTN. NW1/4 SE1/4 (LOT E1, B23/P188)

### Ownership Information
- **Current Owner:** CENTRAL CASCADES LAND CO INC
- **Address:** PO BOX 171 ROSLYN WA
- **Zipcode:** 98941

### Assessment Data
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax District</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
<th>Open Space Date</th>
<th>Senior Exemption</th>
<th>Deeded Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Imp: 0</td>
<td>Total: 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Market Value
- **Land:** 185,310
- **Imp:** 0
- **Perm Crop:** 0
- **Total:** 185,310

### Taxable Value
- **Land:** 185,310
- **Imp:** 0
- **Perm Crop:** 0
- **Total:** 185,310

### Sales History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Book &amp; Page</th>
<th># Parcels</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08-31-2001</td>
<td>13307</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>WESTERN ELITE INC SERVICES</td>
<td>CENTRAL CASCADES LAND CO INC</td>
<td>3,515,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-26-2000</td>
<td>11794</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>HERBRAND COMPANY THE</td>
<td>WESTERN ELITE INC SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-26-2000</td>
<td>11791</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>PLUM CREEK LAND CO</td>
<td>HERBRAND COMPANY THE</td>
<td>4,627,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Building Permits
- **NO ACTIVE PERMITS!**

### 5 Year Valuation Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Billed Owner</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Impr.</th>
<th>PermCrop Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>CENTRAL CASCADES LAND CO INC</td>
<td>185,310</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>185,310</td>
<td>185,310</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>CENTRAL CASCADES LAND CO INC</td>
<td>185,310</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>185,310</td>
<td>185,310</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>CENTRAL CASCADES LAND CO INC</td>
<td>94,320</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>94,320</td>
<td>94,320</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>CENTRAL CASCADES LAND CO INC</td>
<td>94,320</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>94,320</td>
<td>94,320</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>CENTRAL CASCADES LAND CO INC</td>
<td>94,320</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>94,320</td>
<td>94,320</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>CENTRAL CASCADES LAND CO INC</td>
<td>94,320</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>94,320</td>
<td>94,320</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parcel Comments

Parcel Comments
NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!

Filed: 8/17/2006 5:00:00 PM
Kittitas County
Assessor

205 W 5th Ave Suite 101
Ellensburg, WA 98926
Phone: (509)962-7501
Fax: (509)962-7666

Property Summary (Appraisal Details)

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 14758
Map Number: 20-15-21040-0009
Situs: UNKNOWN ROSLYN
Legal: ACRES 25.40, CO. 6256-7; SEC. 21, TWP. 20,
RGE. 15; PTN. W1/2 SE1/4 (LOT E3, B23/P188)

Ownership Information
Current Owner: CENTRAL CASCADES LAND CO INC
Address: PO BOX 171
City, State: ROSLYN WA
Zipcode: 98941

Assessment Data
Tax District: 43
Open Space:

Open Space Date:
Senior Exemption:
Deeded Acres: 25.4
Last Revaluation for Tax Year:

Market Value
Land: 209,340
Imp: 0
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 209,340

Taxable Value
Land: 209,340
Imp: 0
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 209,340

Sales History
Date  Book & Page  # Parcels  Grantor  Grantee  Price
08-31-2001  13307  17  WESTERN ELITE INC  CENTRAL CASCADES LAND CO INC  3,515,200
12-26-2000  11794  35  HERBRAND COMPANY THE  WESTERN ELITE INC SERVICES  4,627,000
12-26-2000  11791  35  PLUM CREEK LAND CO  HERBRAND COMPANY THE

Building Permits
NO ACTIVE PERMITS!

5 Year Valuation Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Billed Owner</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Impr.</th>
<th>PermCrop Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>CENTRAL CASCADES LAND CO INC</td>
<td>209,340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>209,340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>209,340</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>CENTRAL CASCADES LAND CO INC</td>
<td>209,340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>209,340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>209,340</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>CENTRAL CASCADES LAND CO INC</td>
<td>115,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115,400</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>CENTRAL CASCADES LAND CO INC</td>
<td>115,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115,400</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>CENTRAL CASCADES LAND CO INC</td>
<td>115,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115,400</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>CENTRAL CASCADES LAND CO INC</td>
<td>115,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115,400</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/t-assessor.asp?pid=14758

8/18/2006
Parcel Comments
NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!

Filedate: 8/17/2006 5:00:00 PM
Kittitas County Assessor

Parcel Information

Parcel Number: 14757
Map Number: 20-15-21040-0008
Situs: UNKNOWN ROSLYN
Legal: ACRES 20.06, CD. 6256-6; SEC. 21, TWP. 20, RGE. 15; PTN. NE1/4 SE1/4 (LOT E2, B23/P188)

Ownership Information

Current Owner: CENTRAL CASCADES LAND CO INC
Address: PO BOX 171
City, State: ROSLYN WA
Zipcode: 98941

Assessment Data

Tax District: 43
Open Space: 
Open Space Date: 
Senior Exemption: 
Deeded Acres: 20.06
Last Revaluation for Tax Year:

Market Value

Land: 170,090
Imp: 0
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 170,090

Taxable Value

Land: 170,090
Imp: 0
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 170,090

Sales History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Book &amp; Page</th>
<th># Parcels</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08-31-2001</td>
<td>13307</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>WESTERN ELITE INC SERVICES</td>
<td>CENTRAL CASCADES LAND CO INC</td>
<td>3,515,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-26-2000</td>
<td>11794</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>HERBRAND COMPANY THE SERVICES</td>
<td>WESTERN ELITE INC</td>
<td>4,627,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-26-2000</td>
<td>11791</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>PLUM CREEK LAND CO</td>
<td>HERBRAND COMPANY THE SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Building Permits

NO ACTIVE PERMITS!

5 Year Valuation Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Billed Owner</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Impr.</th>
<th>PermCrop Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>CENTRAL CASCADES LAND CO INC</td>
<td>170,090</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>170,090</td>
<td></td>
<td>170,090</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>CENTRAL CASCADES LAND CO INC</td>
<td>170,090</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>170,090</td>
<td></td>
<td>170,090</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>CENTRAL CASCADES LAND CO INC</td>
<td>96,710</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>96,710</td>
<td></td>
<td>96,710</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>CENTRAL CASCADES LAND CO INC</td>
<td>96,710</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>96,710</td>
<td></td>
<td>96,710</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>CENTRAL CASCADES LAND CO INC</td>
<td>96,710</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>96,710</td>
<td></td>
<td>96,710</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>CENTRAL CASCADES LAND CO INC</td>
<td>96,710</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>96,710</td>
<td></td>
<td>96,710</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/t-assessor.asp?pid=14757

8/18/2006
### Perm Crop Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop Code</th>
<th>Crop Description</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3APP</td>
<td>.5 AC HONEY CRISP</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3APP</td>
<td>OLDER APPLE VAR</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2GAL</td>
<td>GALA2 LOW DENSITY</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2GAL</td>
<td>GALA2 LOW DENSITY</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3APP</td>
<td>SEMI-DWARFS</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3APP</td>
<td>DWARFS</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3APP</td>
<td>.25 EARLY GOLD</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perm Crop Total Acres: **6.12**

### Miscellaneous Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SINGLE 1 STORY</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Photos/Sketches

Filedate: 8/17/2006 5:00:00 PM
## Farm Residence Data Sheet

### Parcel Information
- **Parcel Number:** 690433
- **Map Number:** 12-19-34000-0001
- **Situs:** 05800 \(\text{TH}^{\text{R}}\) ALL RD \text{ELLENSBURG}
- **Legal:** ACRES 17.50, CD. 10103; SEC. 34; TWP. 17; RGE. 19; NE1/4 NE1/4 TAX 4; 2.90 CO. RD.
- **Deeded Acres:** 17.5

### Ownership Information
- **Current Owner:** GRAYBILL, BRIAN L ETUX
- **Address:** 5800 THRALL RD
- **City, State:** ELLensburg WA
- **Zipcode:** 98926

### Physical Information
- **Type:** Single Family (1)
- **Quality:** Average
- **Condition:** Good
- **Arch Type:** 1B
- **Style:** One Story (1) 100 %
- **Exterior Wall:** 100 % Siding
- **Floor Area:** 1496
- **Basement Area:** 1496
- **Basement:** 1496
- **Finish:**
- **Bedrooms:** 3
- **Baths:** 2
- **Plumbing:** 8
- **Fixtures:**
- **Heat Type:** Forced Air (1)
- **Roof Type:** Concrete Tile (5)
- **Garage Type:**
- **Garage Size:**
- **Year Built / Age:** 1935 / 71
- **Effective Age:** 71
- **Remodel Date:**
- **Remodel Type:**

### Agland Information
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th># Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C13</td>
<td>HOME</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6.C2</td>
<td>IRRG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6.C2</td>
<td>IRRG</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11</td>
<td>RANGE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Acres:</strong> 17.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Site Improvement Information
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Year In</th>
<th># Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UTIL</td>
<td>UtilBdg</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>1280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPS</td>
<td>MachShd</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSP</td>
<td>ConcPrch</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSP</td>
<td>ConcPrch</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>Conc Por/Stp</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLX</td>
<td>WELL</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPTG</td>
<td>Septc,Gravity</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTG</td>
<td>DetGar</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTST</td>
<td>UtilShd</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>768</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kittitas County Assessor
205 W 5th Ave Suite 101
Ellensburg, WA 98926
Phone: (509)962-7501
Fax: (509)962-7666

Property Summary (Appraisal Details)

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 690433
Map Number: 17-19-34000-0001
Situs: 05800 THRALL RD ELLENSBURG
Legal: ACRES 17.90, CD. 10103; SEC. 34; TWP. 17; RGE. 19; NE1/4 NE1/4 TAX 4; 2.90 CO. RD.

Ownership Information
Current Owner: GRAYBILL, BRIAN L ETUX
Address: 5800 THRALL RD
City, State: ELLENSBURG WA
Zipcode: 98926

Assessment Data
Tax District: 22
Open Space: YES
Open Space Date: 1/1/1978
Senior Exemption:
Deeded Acres: 17.5
Last Revaluation for Tax Year:

Market Value
Land: 88,000
Imp: 178,470
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 266,470

Taxable Value
Land: 7,720
Imp: 178,470
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 186,190

Sales History
Date: 05-31-2005
Book & Page: 2005-1314
# Parcels: 1
Grantor: KUKES, HARRY
Grantee: GRAYBILL, BRIAN L ETUX
Price: 315,000

Building Permits
NO ACTIVE PERMITS!

5 Year Valuation Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Billed Owner</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Impr.</th>
<th>PermCrop</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>GRAYBILL, BRIAN L ETUX</td>
<td>7,720</td>
<td>178,470</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>186,190</td>
<td>186,190</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>GRAYBILL, BRIAN L ETUX</td>
<td>6,530</td>
<td>120,080</td>
<td>126,610</td>
<td>144,790</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>GRAYBILL, BRIAN L ETUX</td>
<td>6,530</td>
<td>128,520</td>
<td>135,050</td>
<td>144,790</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>GRAYBILL, BRIAN L ETUX</td>
<td>6,530</td>
<td>128,520</td>
<td>135,050</td>
<td>144,790</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>GRAYBILL, BRIAN L ETUX</td>
<td>6,530</td>
<td>128,520</td>
<td>135,050</td>
<td>144,790</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>GRAYBILL, BRIAN L ETUX</td>
<td>6,620</td>
<td>157,820</td>
<td>164,440</td>
<td>174,340</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parcel Comments
NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!

Photos/Sketches

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/t-assessor.asp?pid=690433
8/18/2006
Perm Crop Total Acres: 6.12

Miscellaneous Improvements
NO MISCELLANEOUS IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Filedate: 8/17/2006 5:00:00 PM
# Farm Residence Data Sheet

## Parcel Information
- **Parcel Number:** 20790
- **Map Number:** 17-19-34000-0049
- **Situs:** 1THRLRD ELLensburg
- **Legal:** ACRES 17.90; SEC. 34, TWP. 17, RGE. 19; NW1/4 NE1/4 TAX 1
- **Deeded Acres:** 17.9

## Ownership Information
- **Current Owner:** GRAYBILL, BRIAN L ETUX
- **Address:** 5800 THRALL RD
- **City, State:** ELLensburg WA
- **Zipcode:** 98926

## Physical Information
- **Type:** 
- **Quality:** 
- **Condition:** 
- **Arch Type:** 
- **Style:** error
- **Exterior Wall:** N/A
- **Floor Area:** 
- **Basement Area:** 
- **Basement Finish:** 
- **Bedrooms:** 
- **Baths:** 
- **Plumbing:** 
- **Fixtures:** 
- **Heat Type:** 
- **Roof Type:** 
- **Garage Type:** 
- **Garage Size:** 
- **Year Built / Age:** / 
- **Effective Age:** 
- **Remodel Date:** 
- **Remodel Type:**

## Agland Information
- **Class:** A6.C2
- **Type:** IRRG
- **Use:** IRRG
- **# Acres:** 17.9
- **Total Acres:** 17.9

## Site Improvement Information
- **NO SITE IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!**

## Perm Crop Information
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop Code</th>
<th>Crop Description</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3APP</td>
<td>.5AC HONEY CRISP</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3APP</td>
<td>OLDER APPLE VAR</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2GAL</td>
<td>GALA2 LOW DENSITY</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2GAL</td>
<td>GALA2 LOW DENSITY</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3APP</td>
<td>SEMI-DWARFS</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3APP</td>
<td>DWARFS</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3APP</td>
<td>.25 EARLY GOLD</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Property Summary (Appraisal Details)

#### Parcel Information
- **Parcel Number:** 20790
- **Map Number:** 17-19-34000-0049
- **Situs:** 1/THRALL RD ELLensburg
- **Legal:** ACRES 17.90; SEC. 34, TWP. 17, RGE. 19; NW1/4 NE1/4 TAX 1

#### Ownership Information
- **Current Owner:** GRAYBILL, BRIAN L ETUX
- **Address:** 5800 THRALL RD
- **City, State:** ELLensburg WA
- **Zipcode:** 98926

#### Assessment Data
- **Tax District:** 22
- **Open Space:** YES
- **Open Space Date:** 1/1/1978
- **Senior Exemption:**
- **Deeded Acres:** 17.9
- **Last Revaluation for Tax Year:**

#### Market Value
- **Land:** 46,540
- **Imp:** 8,440
- **Perm Crop:** 0
- **Total:** 54,980

#### Taxable Value
- **Land:** 11,560
- **Imp:** 8,440
- **Perm Crop:** 0
- **Total:** 20,000

#### Sales History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Book &amp; Page</th>
<th># Parcels</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06-03-2005</td>
<td>2005-1343</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>KUKES, HARRY</td>
<td>GRAYBILL, BRIAN L ETUX</td>
<td>185,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Building Permits
- **NO ACTIVE PERMITS!**

#### 5 Year Valuation Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Billed Owner</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Impr.</th>
<th>Perm Crop Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>GRAYBILL, BRIAN L ETUX</td>
<td>11,560</td>
<td>8,440</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>GRAYBILL, BRIAN L ETUX</td>
<td>9,740</td>
<td>8,440</td>
<td></td>
<td>18,180</td>
<td>18,180</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Parcel Comments
- **NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!**

Filedate: 8/17/2006 5:00:00 PM

Parcel Comments
NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!

Photos/Sketches

TerraScan

Filedate: 8/17/2006 5:00:00 PM

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/t-assessor.asp?pid=763034

8/18/2006
Kittitas County Assessor

205 W 5th Ave Suite 101
Ellensburg, WA 98926
Phone: (509) 962-7501
Fax: (509) 962-7666

Property Summary  (Appraisal Details)

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 763034
Map Number: 20-15-21030-0030
Situs: 03131 \SR 903 ROSLYN
Legal: ACRES 1.00, CD. 6244-B-1; SEC.21; TWP.20;
RGE.15; PTN. W1/4 SW1/4

Ownership Information
Current Owner: SUKERT, ROBERT E
Address: 631 PEBBLE BEACH DR
City, State: CLE ELUM WA
Zipcode: 98922-

Assessment Data
Tax District: 43
Open Space: Land: 174,240
Open Space: Imp: 307,860
Date: Perm Crop: 0
Senior Total: 482,100
Exemption: Taxable Total: 482,100
Deeded Acres: 1
Last Revaluation for Tax Year:

Market Value

Taxable Value

Sales History
Date Book & Page # Parcels Grantor Grantee Price
04-21-2003 17329 1 LOVEJOY, STEPHEN A. SUKERT, ROBERT E 300,000
ETUX
04-21-2003 17329 1 CONVERSION MISSING CONVERSION MISSING OWNERS OWNERS 300,000

Building Permits

Permit No. Date Description Amount
2004-08021 8/5/2004 90% CNEW STOR UNITS 3500 SQFT 88,650
2004-08020 8/5/2004 CNEW STOR UNITS 4500 SQFT 132,975

5 Year Valuation Information

Year Billed Owner Land Impr. PermCrop Value Total Exempt Taxable Taxes
2006 SUKERT, ROBERT E 174,240 307,860 0 482,100 482,100 View Taxes
2005 SUKERT, ROBERT E 174,240 102,540 276,780 View Taxes
2004 SUKERT, ROBERT E 34,500 91,740 126,240 View Taxes
2003 SUKERT, ROBERT E 34,500 91,740 126,240 View Taxes
2002 SUKERT, ROBERT E 34,500 91,740 126,240 View Taxes
2001 SUKERT, ROBERT E 34,500 91,740 126,240 View Taxes

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/t-assessor.asp?pid=763034
8/18/2006
Kittitas County Assessor

205 W 5th Ave Suite 101
Ellensburg, WA 98926
Phone: (509)962-7501
Fax: (509)962-7666

Commercial Data Sheet

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 763034
Map Number: 20-15-21030-0030
Situs: 03131 SR 903 ROSLYN
Legal: ACRES 1.00, CD. 6244-B-1; SEC.21; TWP.20;
RGE.15; PTN. W1/4 SW1/4

Ownership Information
Business Name: SUKERT, ROBERT E
Current Owner: SUKERT, ROBERT E
Address: 631 PEBBLE BEACH DR
City, State: CLE ELUM WA
Zipcode: 98922

Lot Information
Topography:
Amenities:
Lot Width: Lot Depth:

Building Cost Approach Data
Year Class Area Perim. Story/Height
WAREHOUSE, MINI D 4375 Ext. Wall: N/A 1 / 10 Heat/Cool:
WAREHOUSE, MINI D 3000 Ext. Wall: N/A 1 / 10 Heat/Cool:

Refinement Cost Data
Description Year No. Units
Asphalt

Photos/Sketches
Filedate: 8/17/2006 5:00:00 PM

# Commercial Data Sheet

## Parcel Information
- **Parcel Number:** 763034
- **Map Number:** 20-15-21030-0030
- **Situs:** 03131'SR 903 ROSLYN
- **Legal:** ACRES 1.00, CO. 6244-B-1; SEC.21; TWP.20; RGE.15; PTN. W1/4 SW1/4

## Ownership Information
- **Business Name:** SUKERT, ROBERT E
- **Current Owner:**
- **Address:** 631 PEBBLE BEACH DR
- **City, State:** CLE ELUM WA 98922-
- **Zipcode:** 98922-

## Lot Information
- **Topography:**
- **Amenities:**
- **Lot Width:**
- **Lot Depth:**

## Building Cost Approach Data
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Perim.</th>
<th>Story/Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WAREHOUSE, MINI</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4375</td>
<td>Ext. Wall: N/A</td>
<td>1 / 10 Heat/Cool:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>Ext. Wall: N/A</td>
<td>1 / 10 Heat/Cool:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Refinement Cost Data
- **Description:** Asphalt
- **Year:** 6640

## Photos/Sketches
Residential Data Sheet

Parcel Information

Parcel Number: 763034
Map Number: 20-15-21030-0030
Situs: 03131 ISR 903 ROSLYN
Legal: ACRES 1.00, CD. 6244-B-1; SEC.21; TWP.20; RGE.15; PTN. W1/4 SW1/4

Ownership Information

Current Owner: SUKERT, ROBERT E
Address: 631 PEBBLE BEACH DR
City, State: CLE ELUM WA
Zipcode: 98922-

Lot Information

Topography: FL
Amenities:
Lot Width: IRR
Lot Depth: 43560

Street Access: PYY
Utilities: PWSSP
Deeded Acres: 1

Physical Information

Type:  
Quality:  
Condition:  
Arch Type:  
Style: error  
Exterior Wall: N/A  
Floor Area:  
Basement Area:  
Basement: 0  
Finish:  
Bedrooms:  

Baths:  
Plumbing:  
Fixtures:  
Heat Type:  
Roof Type:  
Garage Type:  
Garage Size:  
Year Built / Age: /  
Effective Age:  
Remodel Date:  
Remodel Type:  

Miscellaneous Improvements

Improvement
Year  Size
386  2005  4375
386  2005  3000
Asphalt 2005  6640

Photos/Sketches

Filedate: 8/17/2006 5:00:00 PM

**Residential Data Sheet**

### Parcel Information
- **Parcel Number:** 763034
- **Map Number:** 20-15-21030-0030
- **Situs:** 03131 ISR 903 ROSLYN
- **Legal:** ACRE 1.00, CD. 8244-B-1; SEC.21; TWP.20; RGE.15; PTN. W1/4 SW1/4

### Ownership Information
- **Current Owner:** SUKERT, ROBERT E
- **Address:** 631 PEBBLE BEACH DR
- **City, State:** CLE ELUM WA
- **Zipcode:** 98922

### Lot Information
- **Topography:** FL
- **Amenities:**
- **Lot Width:** IRR
- **Lot Depth:** 43560
- **Street Access:** PPY
- **Utilities:** PWSSP
- **Deeded Acres:** 1

### Physical Information
- **Type:** Single Family (1)
- **Quality:** Fair/Avg.
- **Condition:** Very Good
- **Arch Type:**
- **Style:** One Half Story Finished (4) 100 %
- **Exterior Wall:** 100 % N/A
- **Floor Area:** 1707
- **Basement Area:**
- **Basement:** 0
- **Finish:**
- **Bedrooms:** 3

- **Baths:** 5
- **Plumbing:**
- **Fixtures:**
- **Heat Type:** Forced Air (1)
- **Roof Type:**
- **Garage Type:**
- **Garage Size:**
- **Year Built / Age:** 1925 / 80
- **Effective Age:** 81
- **Remodel Date:**
- **Remodel Type:**

### Miscellaneous Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SINGLE 1 STORY</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CvWdPor</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septic,Gravity</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wd Deck</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToolShd 12X12</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RfCvr</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Photos/Sketches**

Filedate: 8/17/2006 5:00:00 PM

## Property Summary

### Parcel Information
- **Parcel Number:** 763034
- **Map Number:** 20-15-21030-0030
- **Situs:** 03131 \&R 903 ROSLYN
- **Legal:** ACRES 1.00, CD. 6244-B-1; SEC.21; TWP.20; RGE.15; PTN. W1/4 SW1/4

### Ownership Information
- **Current Owner:** SUKERT, ROBERT E
- **Address:** 631 PEBBLE BEACH DR
- **City, State:** CLE ELUM WA
- **Zipcode:** 98922-

### Assessment Data
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax District</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
<th>Open Space Date</th>
<th>Senior Exemption</th>
<th>Deeded Acres</th>
<th>Last Revaluation for Tax Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Market Value
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxable Value</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Imp.</th>
<th>Perm Crop</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>174,240</td>
<td>307,860</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>482,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Taxable Value
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxable Value</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Imp.</th>
<th>Perm Crop</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>174,240</td>
<td>307,860</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>482,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sales History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Book &amp; Page</th>
<th># Parcels</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04-21-2003</td>
<td>17329</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LOVEJOY, STEPHEN A. ETUX</td>
<td>SUKERT, ROBERT E</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-21-2003</td>
<td>17329</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CONVERSION MISSING OWNERS</td>
<td>CONVERSION MISSING OWNERS</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Building Permits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-08021</td>
<td>8/5/2004</td>
<td>90% CNEW STOR UNITS 3500 SQFT</td>
<td>88,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-08020</td>
<td>8/5/2004</td>
<td>CNEW STOR UNITS 4500 SQFT</td>
<td>132,975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5 Year Valuation Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Billed Owner</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Impr.</th>
<th>PermCrop Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>SUKERT, ROBERT E</td>
<td>174,240</td>
<td>307,860</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>482,100</td>
<td>482,100</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>SUKERT, ROBERT E</td>
<td>174,240</td>
<td>102,540</td>
<td>276,780</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>SUKERT, ROBERT E</td>
<td>34,500</td>
<td>91,740</td>
<td>126,240</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>SUKERT, ROBERT E</td>
<td>34,500</td>
<td>91,740</td>
<td>126,240</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>SUKERT, ROBERT E</td>
<td>34,500</td>
<td>91,740</td>
<td>126,240</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>SUKERT, ROBERT E</td>
<td>34,500</td>
<td>91,740</td>
<td>126,240</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


8/18/2006
Parcel Comments
NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!

Photos/Sketches

Filedate: 8/17/2006 5:00:00 PM

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/t-assessor.asp?pid=763034

8/18/2006
Farm Residence Data Sheet

Parcel Information

Parcel Number: 10167
Map Number: 18-18-21040-0006
Situs: 02910 FAUST RD ELLENSBURG
Legal: ACRES 10.02, CD. 8643-2; SEC. 21; TWP. 18;
RGE. 18; PTLN. SW1/4 SE1/4 SLY OF TOWN
DITCH (PARCEL A SURVEY #577564 B20/P159)
Deeded Acres: 10.02

Ownership Information

Current Owner: SINCLAIR, BASIL L.
Address: 2910 FAUST ROAD
City, State: ELLensburg WA
Zipcode: 98926

Physical Information

Type: Mobile Home (4)
Quality: Very Good
Condition: Very Good
Arch Type:
Style: One Story (1) 100 %
Exterior Wall: 100 % Siding
Floor Area: 2400
Basement Area:
Basement Finish:
Bedrooms:

Baths: 9
Plumbing Fixtures:
Heat Type: Forced Air (1)
Roof Type:
Garage Type:
Garage Size:
Year Built / Age: 1994 / 12
Effective Age: 12
Remodel Date:
Remodel Type:

Agland Information

Class
A7.C3
C7

Type
Use
IRRG
HOME

# Acres
9.02
1
Total Acres: 10.02

Site Improvement Information
NO SITE IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Perm Crop Information
NO PERM CROP RECORDS FOUND!

Miscellaneous Improvements

Improvement
DelGar60x42x0
Year
1995
Size
2520

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/T-Farm.asp?pid=10167&key=611
8/18/2006
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CvWdPor20x16x0</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete56x24x0</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELL</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septic,Gravity</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Photos/Sketches**

Filedate: 8/17/2006 5:00:00 PM

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/T-Farm.asp?pid=10167&key=611
Kittitas County Assessor

205 W 5th Ave Suite 101
Ellensburg, WA 98926
Phone: (509)962-7501
Fax: (509)962-7666

Property Summary (Appraisal Details)

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 10167
Map Number: 18-18-21-04-0006
Situs: 02910 FAUST RD ELLensburg
Legal: ACRES 10.02, CO. 8643-2; SEC. 21; TWP. 18;
RGE. 18; PTN. SW1/4 SE1/4 SLY OF TOWN
DITCH (PARCEL A SURVEY #577564 B20/P159)

Ownership Information
Current Owner: SINCLAIR, BASIL L.
Address: 2910 FAUST ROAD
City, State: ELLensburg WA
Zipcode: 98926

Assessment Data
Tax District: 22
Open Space: YES
Open Date: 1/1/1978
Senior Exemption:
Deeded Acres: 10.02
Last Revaluation for Tax Year:

Market Value
Land: 71,400
Imp: 161,150
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 232,550

Taxable Value
Land: 44,280
Imp: 161,150
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 205,430

Sales History
NO SALES HISTORY RECORDS FOUND!

Building Permits
Permit No. 94-10065
Date 10/21/1994
Description RESOB
Amount 40,572

5 Year Valuation Information

Year Billed Owner Land Impr. PermCrop Value Total Exempt Taxable Taxes
2006 SINCLAIR, BASIL L. 44,280 161,150 0 205,430 205,430 View Taxes
2005 SINCLAIR, BASIL L. 36,100 145,670 181,770 181,770 View Taxes
2004 SINCLAIR, BASIL L. 36,100 145,670 181,770 181,770 View Taxes
2003 SINCLAIR, BASIL L. 36,100 145,670 181,770 181,770 View Taxes
2002 SINCLAIR, BASIL L. 36,100 145,670 181,770 181,770 View Taxes
2001 SINCLAIR, BASIL L. 23,660 132,450 156,110 156,110 View Taxes

Parcel Comments
NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/t-assessor.asp?pid=10167
8/18/2006
Farm Residence Data Sheet

Parcel Information

Parcel Number: 211033
Map Number: 18-18-28000-0001
Situs: FAUST RD ELLensburg
Legal: ACRES 3.00, CD. 8772; SEC. 28, TWP. 18, RGE. 18 NE1/4 NE1/4 TAX NO. 1
Deeded Acres: 3

Ownership Information

Current Owner: SINCLAIR, ARTHUR E. ETUX
Address: 2912 FAUST RD
City, State: ELLensburg WA
Zipcode: 98926

Physical Information

Type: 
Quality: 
Condition: 
Arch Type: 
Style: error
Exterior Wall: N/A
Floor Area: 
Basement Area: 
Basement Finish: 
Bedrooms: 

Baths: 
Plumbing Fixtures: 
Heat Type: 
Roof Type: 
Garage Type: 
Garage Size:
Year Built / Age: /
Effective Age: 
Remodel Date: 
Remodel Type: 

Agland Information

Class
A7.C3
A7.C3

Type

Use
IRRG
IRRG

# Acres
1
2
Total Acres: 3

Site Improvement Information
NO SITE IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Perm Crop Information
NO PERM CROP RECORDS FOUND!

Miscellaneous Improvements
NO MISCELLANEOUS IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!
Kittitas County Assessor

Property Summary (Appraisal Details)

Parcel Information

Parcel Number: 211033
Map Number: 18-18-28000-0001
Situs: FAUST RD ELLENSBURG
Legal: ACRES 3.00, CD. 8772; SEC. 28, TWP. 18, RGE. 18 NE1/4 NE1/4 TAX NO. 1

Ownership Information

Current Owner: SINCLAIR, ARTHUR E. ETUX
Address: 2912 FAUST RD
City, State: ELLENSBURG WA
Zipcode: 98926

Assessment Data

Tax District: 22
Open Space: YES
Open Space Date: 1/1/1976
Senior Exemption: 
Deeded Acres: 3
Last Revaluation for Tax Year:

Market Value

Land: 44,500
Imp: 0
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 44,500

Taxable Value

Land: 1,430
Imp: 0
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 1,430

Sales History

Date: 02-01-1995
Book & Page: 39741
# Parcels: 2
Grantor: SINCLAIR, BASIL L.
Grantee: SINCLAIR, ARTHUR E. ETUX
Price: 250,000

Building Permits

NO ACTIVE PERMITS!

5 Year Valuation Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Billed Owner</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Impr.</th>
<th>PermCrop Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>SINCLAIR, ARTHUR E. ETUX</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>SINCLAIR, ARTHUR E. ETUX</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>SINCLAIR, ARTHUR E. ETUX</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>SINCLAIR, ARTHUR E. ETUX</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>SINCLAIR, ARTHUR E. ETUX</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>SINCLAIR, ARTHUR E. ETUX</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parcel Comments

NO Parcel Comments for This Record!

Filedate: 8/17/2006 5:00:00 PM

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/t-assessor.asp?pid=211033

8/18/2006
# Farm Residence Data Sheet

## Parcel Information
- **Parcel Number:** 706233
- **Map Number:** 18-19-21040-0001
- **Situs:** 02912 FAUST RD ELLensburg
- **Legal:** ACRES 62.68, CO. 8643; SEC. 21; TWP. 18; RGE. 18; PTN. SE1/4 SLY OF TOWN DITCH (PARCEL B SURVEY #577564 B20/P155, ACREAGE NOT SURVEYED)
- **Deeded Acres:** 62.68

## Ownership Information
- **Current Owner:** SINCLAIR, ARTHUR E. ETUX
- **Address:** 2912 FAUST RD
- **City, State:** ELLensburg WA
- **Zipcode:** 98926

## Physical Information
- **Type:** Single Family (1)
- **Quality:** Fair/Avg.
- **Condition:** Good
- **Arch Type:**
- **Style:** Two Story (2) 100%
- **Exterior Wall:** 100% Shingle
- **Floor Area:** 2175
- **Basement Area:**
- **Basement:** 0
- **Finish:**
- **Bedrooms:** 3
- **Baths:** 2
- **Plumbing:** 8
- **Fixtures:**
- **Heat Type:** Forced Air (1)
- **Roof Type:** Composition Shingles (1)
- **Garage Type:**
- **Garage Size:**
- **Year Built / Age:** 1930 / 76
- **Effective Age:** 76
- **Remodel Date:**
- **Remodel Type:**

## A gland Information
- **Class:**
  - C13
  - A7, C3
- **Type:**
- **Use:** HOME
- **IRRGG**
- **# Acres:**
  - 1
  - 61.68
- **Total Acres:** 62.68

## Site Improvement Information
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Year In</th>
<th># Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UTST</td>
<td>utility Shd OLD GAR</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROPO</td>
<td>CwWdPor FRT</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLX</td>
<td>WELL</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPTG</td>
<td>Septic,Gravity</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPS</td>
<td>CvConc BK</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSP</td>
<td>ConcPrch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Peri Crop Information

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/T-Farm.asp?pid=706233&key=7071  
8/18/2006
NO PERM CROP RECORDS FOUND!

Miscellaneous Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SINGLE 1 STORY</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apt</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Photos/Sketches

Filedate: 8/17/2006 5:00:00 PM
Farm Residence Data Sheet

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 706233
Map Number: 18-18-21040-0001
Situs: 02912 FAUST RD ELLensburg
Legal: ACRES 62.68, CD. 8643; SEC. 21; TWP. 18; RGE. 18; Pn. SE1/4 SLY OF TOWN DITCH (PARCEL B SURVEY #577564 B20/P159; ACREAGE NOT SURVEYED)
Deeded Acres: 62.68

Ownership Information
Current Owner: SINCLAIR, ARTHUR E. ETUX
Address: 2912 FAUST RD
City, State: ELLensburg WA
Zipcode: 98926

Physical Information
Type:
Quality:
Condition:
Arch Type:
Style: error
Exterior Wall: N/A
Floor Area:
Basement Area:
Basement Finish:
Bedrooms:

Baths:
Plumbing Fixtures:
Heat Type:
Roof Type:
Garage Type:
Garage Size:
Year Built / Age:
Effective Age:
Remodel Date:
Remodel Type:

Agrland Information
NO AGLAND RECORDS FOUND!

Site Improvement Information
Code Description Year In # Units
HAYS HayCvr MT2 1986 4400
POLE PIUll 1930 600
UTST UtilShd 1930 120

Perm Crop Information
NO PERM CROP RECORDS FOUND!

Miscellaneous Improvements
NO MISCELLANEOUS IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsiferpublic/T-Farm.asp?pid=706233&key=7072
8/18/2006
Property Summary (Appraisal Details)

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 706233
Map Number: 18-18-21040-0001
Situs: 02912 FAUST RD ELLensburg
Legal: ACRES 62.68, CD. 8643; SEC. 21; TWP. 18; RGE. 18; PTN, SE1/4 SLY OF TOWN DITCH (PARCEL B SURVEY #577564 B20/P159, ACREAGE NOT SURVEYED)

Ownership Information
Current Owner: SINCLAIR, ARTHUR E. ETUX
Address: 2912 FAUST RD
City, State: ELLensburg WA
Zipcode: 98926

Assessment Data
Tax District: 22
Open Space: YES
Open Space Date: 1/1/1978
Senior Exemption:
Deeded Acres: 62.68

Market Value
Land: 169,240
Imp: 178,130
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 347,370

Taxable Value
Land: 29,550
Imp: 178,130
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 207,680

Sales History
Date: 02-01-1995
Book & Page: 39741
# Parcels: 2
Grantor: SINCLAIR, BASIL L.
Grantee: SINCLAIR, ARTHUR E. ETUX
Price: 250,000

Building Permits
Permit No.: 2002-02023
Date: 2/11/2002
Description: RADD KITCHEN ADD 300 SQFT
Amount: 21,541

Permit No.: 96-01035
Date: 1/29/1996
Description: RALT ROOF
Amount: 4,000

5 Year Valuation Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Billed Owner</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Impr.</th>
<th>PermCrop Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>SINCLAIR, ARTHUR E. ETUX</td>
<td>29,550</td>
<td>178,130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>207,680</td>
<td>207,680</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>SINCLAIR, ARTHUR E. ETUX</td>
<td>24,840</td>
<td>142,830</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>167,670</td>
<td>167,670</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>SINCLAIR, ARTHUR E. ETUX</td>
<td>24,840</td>
<td>142,830</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>167,670</td>
<td>167,670</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>SINCLAIR, ARTHUR E. ETUX</td>
<td>24,840</td>
<td>142,830</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>167,670</td>
<td>167,670</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>SINCLAIR, ARTHUR E. ETUX</td>
<td>24,840</td>
<td>125,690</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150,530</td>
<td>150,530</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>SINCLAIR, ARTHUR E. ETUX</td>
<td>25,280</td>
<td>108,630</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>133,890</td>
<td>133,890</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parcel Comments

NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!

Photos/Sketches

Filedate: 8/17/2006 5:00:00 PM
Farm Residence Data Sheet

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 382333
Map Number: 17-19-11040-0010
Situs: 1S MAIN ST KITTITAS
Legal: ACRES 57.54, CD. 9799; SEC. 11; TWP. 17; RGE. 19; PTN. SE1/4 SOUTH & EAST OF CARIBU CR. LESS .70 CO.RD.; 19.83 STATE HWY(SR90)
Deeded Acres: 57.54

Ownership Information
Current Owner: GIBB, RONALD J ETUX TRUSTEES & GIBB, DOUGLAS F ETUX TRUSTEES
Address: 680 SORENSON RD
City, State: ELLensburg WA
Zipcode: 98926

Physical Information
Type: error
Quality: 
Condition: 
Arch Type: 
Style: Exterior Wall: N/A
Floor Area: 
Basement Area: 0
Basement: Finish: 
Bedrooms: 
Baths: Plumbing 
Fixtures: 
Heat Type: 
Roof Type: 
Garage Type: 
Garage Size: 
Year Built / Age: / 
Effective Age: 
Remodel Date: 
Remodel Type:

Agricultural Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th># Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A6.C1</td>
<td>IRRG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6.C2</td>
<td>IRRG</td>
<td>13.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6.C3</td>
<td>IRRG</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6.C1</td>
<td>IRRG</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Acres: 57.54

Site Improvement Information
NO SITE IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Perm Crop Information
NO PERM CROP RECORDS FOUND!

Miscellaneous Improvements
NO MISCELLANEOUS IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!
Property Summary (Appraisal Details)

Parcel Information

Parcel Number: 382333
Map Number: 17-19-11040-0010
Situs: U/S MAIN ST KITITAS
Legal: ACRES 57.54, CD. 9799; SEC. 11; TWP. 17; RGE. 19; PTN. SE1/4 SOUTH & EAST OF CARIBU CR. LESS .70 CO.RD.; 19.83 STATE HWY(SR90)

Ownership Information

Current Owner: GIBB, RONALD J ETUX TRUSTEES & GIBB, DOUGLAS F ETUX TRUSTEES
Address: 960 SORENSON RD
City, State: ELLensburg WA
Zipcode: 98926

Assessment Data

Tax District: 26
Open Space: YES
Open Space Date: 1/1/1978
Senior Exemption: Deeded Acres: 57.54
Last Revaluation for Tax Year:

Market Value

Land: 201,590
Imp: 0
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 201,590

Taxable Value

Land: 41,150
Imp: 0
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 41,150

Sales History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Book &amp; Page</th>
<th># Parcels</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04-23-2002</td>
<td>14753</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GIBB, RONALD J ETUX &amp;</td>
<td>GIBB, RONALD J ETUX TRUSTEES &amp;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GIBB, RONALD J ETUX TRUSTEES &amp;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-01-1993</td>
<td>3738400</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>JESSE GIBB ETUX</td>
<td>GIBB, RONALD J ETUX TRUSTEES &amp;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GIBB, RONALD J ETUX TRUSTEES &amp;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Building Permits

NO ACTIVE PERMITS!

5 Year Valuation Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Billed Owner</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Impr.</th>
<th>PermCrop Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>GIBB, RONALD J ETUX TRUSTEES &amp;</td>
<td>41,150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41,150</td>
<td></td>
<td>41,150</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>GIBB, RONALD J ETUX TRUSTEES &amp;</td>
<td>34,590</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34,590</td>
<td></td>
<td>34,590</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>GIBB, RONALD J ETUX TRUSTEES &amp;</td>
<td>34,590</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34,590</td>
<td></td>
<td>34,590</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>GIBB, RONALD J ETUX TRUSTEES &amp;</td>
<td>34,590</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34,590</td>
<td></td>
<td>34,590</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>GIBB, RONALD J ETUX TRUSTEES &amp;</td>
<td>34,590</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34,590</td>
<td></td>
<td>34,590</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>GIBB, RONALD J ETUX TRUSTEES &amp;</td>
<td>35,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>35,200</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parcel Comments
NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!

Filedate: 8/10/2006 5:11:24 PM
Kittitas County
Assessor

205 W 5th Ave Suite 101
Ellensburg, WA 98926
Phone: (509)962-7501
Fax: (509)962-7666

Property Summary (Appraisal Details)

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 064433
Map Number: 16-19-04020-0003
Situs: PERRY RD ELLensburg
Legal: ACRES 27.70, CD, 9404-1; SEC. 4, TWP. 16, RGE. 19 PTN. E. 1000' OF E1/2 NW1/4 LY. N. SR 95 & S. KRD TURBINE LATERAL

Ownership Information
Current Owner: MAHRE, THOMAS W
Address: 1260 ORCHARD RD
City, State: ELLensburg WA
Zipcode: 98926

Assessment Data
Tax District: 19
Open Space: YES
Open Space Date: 1/1/1978
Senior Exemption:
Deeded Acres: 27.7
Last Revaluation for Tax Year:

Market Value
Land: 95,100
Imp: 23,510
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 118,610

Taxable Value
Land: 12,980
Imp: 23,510
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 36,490

Sales History
NO SALES HISTORY RECORDS FOUND!

Building Permits
NO ACTIVE PERMITS!

5 Year Valuation Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Billed Owner</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Impr.</th>
<th>PermCrop Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>MAHRE, THOMAS W</td>
<td>12,980</td>
<td>23,510</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36,490</td>
<td>36,490</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>MAHRE, THOMAS W</td>
<td>10,930</td>
<td>67,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77,930</td>
<td>77,930</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>MAHRE, THOMAS W</td>
<td>10,930</td>
<td>67,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77,930</td>
<td>77,930</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>MAHRE, THOMAS W</td>
<td>10,930</td>
<td>67,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77,930</td>
<td>77,930</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>MAHRE, THOMAS W</td>
<td>10,930</td>
<td>67,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77,930</td>
<td>77,930</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>MAHRE, THOMAS W</td>
<td>11,110</td>
<td>92,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>103,110</td>
<td>103,110</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parcel Comments
NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!

Filedate: 8/17/2006 5:00:00 PM

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/t-assessor.asp?pid=064433
8/18/2006
# Farm Residence Data Sheet

## Parcel Information
- **Parcel Number:** 064433
- **Map Number:** 16-19-04020-0003
- **Situs:** PERRY RD ELLensburg
- **Legal:** ACREs 27.70, CD. 9404-1; SEC. 4, TWP. 16, RGE. 19 PTN. E. 1000' OF E1/2 NW1/4 LY. N. SR 90 & S. KRD TURBINE LATERAL
- **Deeded Acres:** 27.7

## Ownership Information
- **Current Owner:** MAHRE, THOMAS W
- **Address:** 1260 ORCHARD RD
- **City, State:** ELLensburg WA
- **Zipcode:** 98926

## Physical Information
- **Type:**
- **Quality:**
- **Condition:**
- **Arch Type:**
- **Style:** error
- **Exterior Wall:** N/A
- **Floor Area:**
- **Basement Area:** 0
- **Basement Finish:**
- **Bedrooms:**
- **Baths:**
- **Plumbing:**
- **Fixtures:**
- **Heat Type:**
- **Roof Type:**
- **Garage Type:**
- **Garage Size:**
- **Year Built / Age:** /
- **Effective Age:**
- **Remodel Date:**
- **Remodel Type:**

## Agland Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th># Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A6.C2</td>
<td>IRRG</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11</td>
<td>RANGE</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6.C2</td>
<td>IRRG</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Acres:** 27.7

## Site Improvement Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Year In</th>
<th># Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SKW</td>
<td>SPRINK SYS WET P</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Perm Crop Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Crop Description</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3APP</td>
<td>OLDER APPLE VAR</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3APP</td>
<td>OLDER APPLE VAR</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/T-Farm.asp?pid=064433&key=300
3APP OLDER APPLE VAR

1979 3

Perm Crop Total Acres: 20

Miscellaneous Improvements
NO MISCELLANEOUS IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Filedate: 8/17/2006 5:00:00 PM
Kittitas County Assessor

205 W 5th Ave Suite 101
Ellensburg, WA 98926
Phone: (509)962-7501
Fax: (509)962-7666

Property Summary (Appraisal Details)

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 168836
Map Number: 16-19-04010-0008
Situs: DODGE RD ELLensburg
Legal: ACRES 26.00, CD.#9403-2; SEC. 4; TWP. 16; RGE. 19; PTN. NE1/4

Ownership Information
Current Owner: MAHRE, THOMAS W ETUX
Address: 1260 ORCHARD RD
City, State: ELLensburg WA
Zipcode: 98926

Assessment Data
Tax District: 19
Open Space: YES
Open Space Date: 1/1/1980
Senior Exemption: Deeded Acres: 26
Last Revaluation for Tax Year:

Land: 90,200
Impr: 31,350
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 121,550

Market Value
Land: 11,590
Impr: 31,350
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 43,040

Taxable Value

Sales History
Date: 07-01-1988
Book & Page: 2586900
# Parcels: 1
Grantor: FRED H. DIEFENBACH
Grantee: MAHRE, THOMAS W ETUX

Price: 25,500

Building Permits
NO ACTIVE PERMITS!

5 Year Valuation Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Billed Owner</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Impr.</th>
<th>PermCrop Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>MAHRE, THOMAS W ETUX</td>
<td>11,690</td>
<td>31,350</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43,040</td>
<td>43,040</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>MAHRE, THOMAS W ETUX</td>
<td>9,850</td>
<td>66,340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76,190</td>
<td>76,190</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>MAHRE, THOMAS W ETUX</td>
<td>9,850</td>
<td>66,340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76,190</td>
<td>76,190</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>MAHRE, THOMAS W ETUX</td>
<td>9,850</td>
<td>66,340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76,190</td>
<td>76,190</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>MAHRE, THOMAS W ETUX</td>
<td>9,850</td>
<td>66,340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76,190</td>
<td>76,190</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>MAHRE, THOMAS W ETUX</td>
<td>10,010</td>
<td>56,175</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60,185</td>
<td>60,185</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parcel Comments
NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!

Filedate: 8/17/2006 5:00:00 PM

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/t-assessor.asp?pid=168836

8/18/2006
Farm Residence Data Sheet

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 168836
Map Number: 16-19-04010-0008
Situs: DODGE RD ELLENSBURG
Legal: ACRES 26.00, CD.#9403-2; SEC. 4; TWP. 16; RGE. 19; PTN. NE1/4
Deeded Acres: 26

Ownership Information
Current Owner: MAHRE, THOMAS W ETUX
Address: 1260 ORCHARD RD
City, State: ELLENSBURG WA
Zipcode: 98926

Physical Information
Type: 
Quality: 
Condition: 
Arch Type: 
Style: error
Exterior Wall: N/A
Floor Area: 
Basement Area: 
Basement: 0
Finish: 
Bedrooms: 
Baths: 
Plumbing 
Fixtures: 
Heat Type: 
Roof Type: 
Garage Type: 
Garage Size: 
Year Built / Age: /
Effective Age: 
Remodel Date: 
Remodel Type: 

Agland Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th># Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C11</td>
<td>RANGE</td>
<td>IRRG</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6.C2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Acres: 26

Site Improvement Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Year In</th>
<th># Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SKW</td>
<td>SPRINK SYS WET P</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perm Crop Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop Code</th>
<th>Crop Description</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2GAL</td>
<td>GALA2 LOW DENSITY</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3APP</td>
<td>OLDER APPLE VAR</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2FJL</td>
<td>FUJI2 LOW DENSITY</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Miscellaneous Improvements
NO MISCELLANEOUS IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Filedate: 8/17/2006 5:00:00 PM
Kittitas County Assessor

205 W 5th Ave Suite 101
Ellensburg, WA 98926
Phone: (509)662-7501
Fax: (509)662-7666

Property Summary (Appraisal Details)

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 949434
Map Number: 20-15-13000-0001
Situs: ACRES 106.90, CD. 6180; SEC. 13; TWP. 20; RG. 15; PTN SW1/4 (PARCEL A B31/P223)

Ownership Information
Current Owner: IRON SNOWSHOE LLC
Address: 301 W 1ST ST STE B
City, State: CLE ELUM WA
Zipcode: 98922-1074

Assessment Data
Tax District: 31
Open Space: YES
Open Space Date: 1/1/1975
Senior Exemption: 106.9

Market Value
Land: 3,470
Imp: 0
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 3,470

Taxable Value
Land: 3,470
Imp: 0
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 3,470

Sales History
Date | Book & Page | # Parcels | Grantee | Grantor | Price
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
12-28-2005 | 8895 | 15 | AMERICAN FOREST RESOURCES LLC | IRON HORSESHOE LLC | 3,205,000
10-04-1999 | 8895 | 32 | BOISE CASCADE CORPORATION | U S TIMBERLANDS YAKIMA LLC | 59,251,295

Building Permits
NO ACTIVE PERMITS!

5 Year Valuation Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Billed Owner</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Impr.</th>
<th>PermCrop Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>IRON HORSESHOE LLC</td>
<td>3,470</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,470</td>
<td>3,470</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,610</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,610</td>
<td>29,360</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>30,620</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>30,620</td>
<td>30,620</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>31,890</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>31,890</td>
<td>31,890</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td>32,850</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>32,850</td>
<td>32,850</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>34,520</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>34,520</td>
<td>34,520</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parcel Comments
NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/t-assessor.asp?pid=949434
8/14/2006
Kittitas County Assessor
205 W 5th Ave Suite 101
Ellensburg, WA 98926
Phone: (509)962-7501
Fax: (509)962-7666

Farm Residence Data Sheet

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 949434
Map Number: 20-15-13000-0001
Situs:
Legal: ACRES 106.90, CD. 6180; SEC. 13; TWP. 20;
RGE. 15; PTN SW1/4 (PARCEL A B31/P223)
Deeded Acres: 106.9

Ownership Information
Current Owner: IRON SNOWSHOE LLC
Address: 301 W 1ST ST STE B
City, State: CLE ELUM WA
Zipcode: 98922-1074

Physical Information
Type:
Quality:
Condition:
Arch Type: error
Style:
Exterior Wall: N/A
Floor Area:
Basement Area:
Basement: 0
Finish:
Bedrooms:

Baths:
Plumbing:
Fixtures:
Heat Type:
Roof Type:
Garage Type:
Garage Size:
Year Built / Age: /
Effective Age:
Remodel Date:
Remodel Type:

Agland Information
Class
T5-3
T7-2
Type
Use
TIMBER
TIMBER
# Acres
33.62
73.28
Total Acres: 106.9

Site Improvement Information
NO SITE IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Perm Crop Information
NO PERM CROP RECORDS FOUND!

Miscellaneous Improvements
NO MISCELLANEOUS IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/T-Farm.asp?pid=949434&key=12557
8/14/2006
**Property Summary**  (Appraisal Details)

**Parcel Information**
- **Parcel Number:** 22018
- **Map Number:** 20-15-13000-0003
- **Situs:**
- **Legal:** ACRES 106.90; SEC 13; TWP 20; RGE 15; PTN SE1/4 (PARCEL C B31/P223)

**Ownership Information**
- **Current Owner:** IRON SNOWSHOE LLC
- **Address:** 301 W 1ST ST STE B
- **City, State:** CLE ELUM WA
- **Zipcode:** 98922-1074

**Assessment Data**
- **Tax District:** 31
- **Open Space:** YES
- **Open Space Date:**
- **Senior Exemption:**
- **Deeded Acres:** 106.9
- **Last Revaluation for Tax Year:**

**Market Value**
- **Land:** 3,120
- **Imp:** 0
- **Perm Crop:** 0
- **Total:** 3,120

**Taxable Value**
- **Land:** 3,120
- **Imp:** 0
- **Perm Crop:** 0
- **Total:** 3,120

**Sales History**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Book &amp; Page</th>
<th># Parcels</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12-28-2005</td>
<td>2005-3641</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>AMERICAN FOREST RESOURCES LLC</td>
<td>IRON HORSESHOE LLC</td>
<td>3,205,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Building Permits**

NO ACTIVE PERMITS!

**5 Year Valuation Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Billed Owner</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Impr.</th>
<th>PermCrop Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>IRON HORSESHOE LLC</td>
<td>3,120</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,120</td>
<td>3,120</td>
<td>3,120</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parcel Comments**
NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!

Filedate: 8/10/2006 5:11:24 PM
Farm Residence Data Sheet

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 22018
Map Number: 20-15-13000-0003
Situs: 
Legal: ACRES 106.90; SEC 13; TWP 20; RGE 15; PTN SE1/4 (PARCEL C B31/P223)–
Deeded Acres: 106.9

Ownership Information
Current Owner: IRON SNOWSHOE LLC
Address: 301 W 1ST ST STE B
City, State: CLE ELUM WA
Zipcode: 98922-1074

Physical Information
Type: 
Quality: 
Condition: 
Arch Type: 
Style: error
Exterior Wall: N/A
Floor Area: 
Basement Area: 
Basement: 0
Finish: 
Bedrooms: 

Baths: 
Plumbing: 
Fixtures: 
Heat Type: 
Roof Type: 
Garage Type: 
Garage Size: 
Year Built / Age: / 
Effective Age: 
Remodel Date: 
Remodel Type: 

Agland Information
Class Type Use # Acres
T7-2 TIMBER 80.15
T6-3 TIMBER 26.75
Total Acres: 106.9

Site Improvement Information
NO SITE IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Perm Crop Information
NO PERM CROP RECORDS FOUND!

Miscellaneous Improvements
NO MISCELLANEOUS IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/T-Farm.asp?pid=22018&key=12369 8/14/2006
Kittitas County
Assessor

Property Summary
(Appraisal Details)

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 22017
Map Number: 20-15-13000-0002
Situs:
Legal: ACRES 106.90; SEC 13; TWP 20; RGE 15; PTN S1/2 (PARCEL B B31/P223)-

Ownership Information
Current Owner: IRON SNOWSHOE LLC
Address: 301 W 1ST ST STE B
City, State: CLE ELUM WA
Zipcode: 98922-1074

Assessment Data
Tax District: 31
Open Space: YES
Open Space Date:
Senior Exemption:
Deeded Acres: 106.9
Last Revaluation for Tax Year:

Market Value
Land: 3,350
Imp: 0
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 3,350

Taxable Value
Land: 3,350
Imp: 0
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 3,350

Sales History
Date: 12-28-2005
Book & Page: 2005-3641
# Parcels: 15
Grantor: AMERICAN FOREST RESOURCES LLC
Grantee: IRON HORSESHOE LLC
Price: 3,205,000

Building Permits
NO ACTIVE PERMITS!

5 Year Valuation Information
Year: 2006
Billed Owner: IRON HORSESHOE LLC
Land: 3,350
Impr: 0
Perm Crop Value: 0
Total: 3,350
Exempt: 0
Taxable: 3,350
Taxes: View Taxes

Parcel Comments
NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!

Filedate: 8/10/2006 5:11:24 PM

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/t-assessor.asp?pid=22017

8/14/2006
Farm Residence Data Sheet

Parcel Information
- Parcel Number: 22017
- Map Number: 20-15-13000-0002
- Situs:
- Legal: ACRES 106.90; SEC 13; TWP 20; RGE 15; PTN S1/2 (PARCEL B B31/P223)
- Deeded Acres: 106.9

Ownership Information
- Current Owner: IRON SNOWSHOE LLC
- Address: 301 W 1ST ST STE B
- City, State: CLE ELUM WA
- Zipcode: 98922-1074

Physical Information
- Type:
- Quality:
- Condition:
- Arch Type:
- Style: error
- Exterior Wall: N/A
- Floor Area:
- Basement Area:
- Basement Finish: 0
- Bedrooms:
- Baths:
- Plumbing:
- Fixtures:
- Heat Type:
- Roof Type:
- Garage Type:
- Garage Size:
- Year Built / Age:
- Effective Age:
- Remodel Date:
- Remodel Type:

Agland Information
- Class: T7-2, T5-3
- Type: TIMBER, TIMBER
- # Acres: 75.57, 31.33
- Total Acres: 106.9

Site Improvement Information
NO SITE IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Perm Crop Information
NO PERM CROP RECORDS FOUND!

Miscellaneous Improvements
NO MISCELLANEOUS IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/T-Farm.asp?pid=22017&key=12368 8/14/2006
# Property Summary (Appraisal Details)

## Parcel Information
- **Parcel Number:** 622233
- **Map Number:** 17-19-11021-0001
- **Situs:** 004701 INDUSTRIAL LOOP KITTITAS
- **Legal:** ACRS 102.08, CD. 9793; SEC. 11; TWP. 17; RGE. 19; PTN. S1/2 NE1/4 NW1/4; PTN. W1/2 NW1/4; PTN. SE1/4 NW1/4; LESS 3.60 CO. RD.

## Ownership Information
- **Current Owner:** GIBB, JOHN R. ETUX & GIBB, KEVIN W. ETUX
- **Address:** 822 FERGUSON RD N
- **City, State:** ELLensburg WA
- **Zipcode:** 98926

## Assessment Data
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax District</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
<th>Open Space Date</th>
<th>Senior Exemption</th>
<th>Deeded Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>1/1/1978</td>
<td></td>
<td>102.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Market Value
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land:</th>
<th>Imp:</th>
<th>Perm Crop:</th>
<th>Total:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>278,370</td>
<td>15,390</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>293,760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Taxable Value
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land:</th>
<th>Imp:</th>
<th>Perm Crop:</th>
<th>Total:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51,990</td>
<td>15,390</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67,380</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Sales History
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Book &amp; Page</th>
<th># Parcels</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12-01-1989</td>
<td>2866200</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>WOODROW G. HAYES</td>
<td>GIBB, JOHN R. ETUX &amp; WOODROW G. HAYES ETUX HAYES, WOODROW G.</td>
<td>260,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-01-1988</td>
<td>2515000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Building Permits
- **Permit No.:** 99-11029
- **Date:** 11/4/1999
- **Description:** MHNEW MH MOVED
- **Amount:** 

## 5 Year Valuation Information
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Billed Owner</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Impr.</th>
<th>Perm Crop Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>GIBB, JOHN R. ETUX &amp;</td>
<td>51,890</td>
<td>15,390</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67,380</td>
<td>67,380</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>68,890</td>
<td>13,540</td>
<td></td>
<td>82,530</td>
<td>82,530</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>68,890</td>
<td>13,540</td>
<td></td>
<td>82,530</td>
<td>82,530</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>68,890</td>
<td>13,540</td>
<td></td>
<td>82,530</td>
<td>82,530</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td>68,890</td>
<td>13,540</td>
<td></td>
<td>82,530</td>
<td>82,530</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td>68,890</td>
<td>13,540</td>
<td></td>
<td>82,530</td>
<td>82,530</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>42,250</td>
<td>7,370</td>
<td></td>
<td>49,620</td>
<td>49,620</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Parcel Comments

8/14/2006

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxifterpublic/t-assessor.asp?pid=622233
NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!

Photos/Sketches

Filedate: 8/10/2006 5:11:24 PM
Farm Residence Data Sheet

Parcel Information

Parcel Number: 622233
Map Number: 17-19-11021-0001
Situs: 00470 \INDUSTRIAL LOOP KITTITAS
Legal: ACRES 102.08, CD. 9793; SEC. 11; TWP. 17; RGE. 19; PTN. S1/2 NE1/4 NW1/4; PTN. W1/2 NW1/4; PTN. SE1/4 NW1/4; LESS 3.60 CO. RD.
Deeded Acres: 102.08

Ownership Information

Current Owner: GIBB, JOHN R. ETUX & GIBB, KEVIN W. ETUX
Address: 822 FERGUSON RD N
City, State: ELLensburg WA
Zipcode: 98926

Physical Information

Type: error
Quality: N/A
Condition: N/A
Arch Type: N/A
Style: N/A
Exterior Wall: N/A
Floor Area: N/A
Basement Area: N/A
Basement: N/A
Finish: N/A
Bedrooms: N/A

Baths: N/A
Plumbing: N/A
Fixtures: N/A
Heat Type: N/A
Roof Type: N/A
Garage Type: N/A
Garage Size: N/A
Year Built / Age: /
Effective Age: /
Remodel Date: /
Remodel Type: /

Agland Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th># Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td></td>
<td>HOME</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6.C3</td>
<td></td>
<td>IRRG</td>
<td>84.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6.C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>IRRG</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6.C3</td>
<td></td>
<td>IRRG</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Acres: 102.08

Site Improvement Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Year In</th>
<th># Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAYS</td>
<td>HayCvr</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCLT</td>
<td>HayCvrWng 6X6/AV</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCLT</td>
<td>HayCvrWng 6X6/AV</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPS</td>
<td>MachShd</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLX</td>
<td>GBN-FLX 2 SMALL</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLX</td>
<td>OTB</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSIK</td>
<td>ImpFee Kittitas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/T-Farm.asp?pid=622233&key=6555
8/14/2006
Perm Crop Information
NO PERM CROP RECORDS FOUND!

Miscellaneous Improvements
NO MISCELLANEOUS IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Photos/Sketches

Filedate: 8/10/2006 5:11:24 PM

terraScan
Kittitas County Assessor

205 W 5th Ave Suite 101
Ellensburg, WA 98926
Phone: (509)962-7501
Fax: (509)962-7666

Property Summary (Appraisal Details)

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 342333
Map Number: 17-19-11030-0016
Situs: 15 MAIN ST KITITAS
Legal: ACRE 74.32, CO. 9800-2; SEC. 11, TWP. 17,
RGE. 19 PTN. E1/2 SW1/4

Ownership Information
Current Owner: GIBB, RONALD J ETUX TRUSTEES &
GIBB, DOUGLAS F ETUX TRUSTEES
Address: 660 SORENSON RD
City, State: ELLensburg WA
Zipcode: 98926

Assessment Data
Tax District: 25
Open Space: YES
Open Space Date: 1/1/1978
Senior Exemption: 
Deeded Acres: 74.32
Last Revaluation for Tax Year:

Market Value
Land: 237,820
Imp: 0
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 237,820

Taxable Value
Land: 48,010
Imp: 0
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 48,010

Sales History
Date: 04-23-2002
Book & Page: 14752
# Parcels: 3
Grantor: SORENSON, ELLEN C. &

Date: 09-01-1988
Book & Page: 2619200
# Parcels: 2
Grantor: JOHN B. SORENSON

Grantee: GIBB, RONALD J ETUX TRUSTEES &
SORENSON, ELLEN C. &

Price: 407,760

Building Permits
NO ACTIVE PERMITS!

5 Year Valuation Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Billed Owner</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Impr.</th>
<th>PermCrop Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>GIBB, RONALD J ETUX TRUSTEES &amp;</td>
<td>48,010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48,010</td>
<td></td>
<td>48,010</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>GIBB, RONALD J ETUX TRUSTEES &amp;</td>
<td>40,430</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40,430</td>
<td></td>
<td>40,430</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>GIBB, RONALD J ETUX TRUSTEES &amp;</td>
<td>40,430</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40,430</td>
<td></td>
<td>40,430</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>GIBB, RONALD J ETUX TRUSTEES &amp;</td>
<td>40,430</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40,430</td>
<td></td>
<td>40,430</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>GIBB, RONALD J ETUX TRUSTEES &amp;</td>
<td>40,430</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40,430</td>
<td></td>
<td>40,430</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>GIBB, RONALD J ETUX TRUSTEES &amp;</td>
<td>41,100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>41,500</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/t-assessor.asp?pid=342333

8/14/2006
Farm Residence Data Sheet

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 342333
Map Number: 17-19-11030-0016
Situs: 1S MAIN ST KITTITAS
Legal: ACRES 74.32, CD. 9800-2; SEC. 11, TWP. 17, RGE. 19 PTN. E1/2 SW1/4
Deeded Acres: 74.32

Ownership Information
Current Owner: GIBB, RONALD J ETUX TRUSTEES &
GIBB, DOUGLAS F ETUX TRUSTEES
Address: 660 SORENSON RD
City, State: ELLENSBURG WA
Zipcode: 98926

Physical Information
Type:
Quality:
Condition:
Arch Type:
Style: error
Exterior Wall: N/A
Floor Area:
Basement Area:
Basement: 0
Finish:
Bedrooms:
Baths:
Plumbing
Fixtures:
Heat Type:
Roof Type:
Garage Type:
Garage Size:
Year Built / Age: /
Effective Age:
Remodel Date:
Remodel Type:

Agrand Information
Class: A6.C2
Type: IRRG
Use: IRRG
# Acres: 74.32
Total Acres: 74.32

Site Improvement Information
NO SITE IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Perm Crop Information
NO PERM CROP RECORDS FOUND!

Miscellaneous Improvements
NO MISCELLANEOUS IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Fil edate: 8/10/2006 5:11:24 PM

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/T-Farm.asp?pid=342333&key=4748
8/14/2006
### Property Summary (Appraisal Details)

**Parcel Information**

- **Parcel Number:** 491033
- **Map Number:** 18-18-27020-0003
- **Situs:** DRY CREEK RD ELLENSBURG
- **Legal:** ACRES 25.77, CD. 8744; SEC. 27; TWP. 18; RGE. 18; NE1/4 NW1/4 TAX NO. 7; NW1/4 NW1/4 TAX NO. 35

**Ownership Information**

- **Current Owner:** CLE ELUM PINES EAST LLC
- **Address:** 1890 NELSON SIDING RD
- **City, State:** CLE ELUM WA
- **Zipcode:** 98922

### Assessment Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax District:</th>
<th>22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open Space:</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>1/1/1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Exemption:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deeded Acres:</td>
<td>25.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Revaluation for Tax Year:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Market Value

- **Land:** 108,230
- **Imp:** 0
- **Perm Crop:** 0
- **Total:** 108,230

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxable Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perm Crop: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: 12,240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sales History

- **Date:** 06-06-2006
- **Book & Page:** 2006-1367
- **# Parcels:** 2
- **Grantor:** GREENE, MARK L. ETUX
- **Grantee:** CLE ELUM PINES EAST LLC
- **Price:** 1,000,000

- **Date:** 12-01-1997
- **Book & Page:** 4943
- **# Parcels:** 2
- **Grantor:** SPURLING, L. GENE ETUX
- **Grantee:** GREENE, MARK L. ETUX
- **Price:** 160,000

### Building Permits

**NO ACTIVE PERMITS!**

### 5 Year Valuation Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Billed Owner</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Impr.</th>
<th>PermCrop Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>GREENE, MARK L. ETUX</td>
<td>12,240</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,240</td>
<td>12,240</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>GREENE, MARK L. ETUX</td>
<td>10,280</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,280</td>
<td>10,280</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>GREENE, MARK L. ETUX</td>
<td>10,280</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,280</td>
<td>10,280</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>GREENE, MARK L. ETUX</td>
<td>10,280</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,280</td>
<td>10,280</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>GREENE, MARK L. ETUX</td>
<td>10,280</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,280</td>
<td>10,280</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>GREENE, MARK L. ETUX</td>
<td>10,460</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,460</td>
<td>10,460</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parcel Comments

**NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!**

# Farm Residence Data Sheet

## Parcel Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Number</td>
<td>491033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map Number</td>
<td>18-18-27020-0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situs</td>
<td>DRY CREEK RD ELLensburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>ACRES 25.77, CD. 8744; SEC. 27; TWP. 18; RGE. 18; NE1/4 NW1/4 TAX NO. 7; NW1/4 NW1/4 TAX NO. 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deeded Acres</td>
<td>25.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Ownership Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Owner</td>
<td>CLE ELUM PINES EAST LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>1890 NELSON SIDING RD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, State</td>
<td>CLE ELUM WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zipcode</td>
<td>98922-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Physical Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch Type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Wall</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basement Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basement</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedrooms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixtures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heat Type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof Type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage Type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage Size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Built / Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remodel Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remodel Type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Agland Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>A7.C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>IRRG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Acres</td>
<td>25.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Acres                  | 25.77                         |

## Site Improvement Information

**NO SITE IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!**

## Perm Crop Information

**NO PERM CROP RECORDS FOUND!**

## Miscellaneous Improvements

**NO MISCELLANEOUS IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!**
### Property Summary

**Parcel Information**
- **Parcel Number:** 481033
- **Map Number:** 18-18-27020-0002
- **Situs:** UNKNOWN ELLensburg
- **Legal:** ACRES 32.77, CD. 8747; SEC. 27; TWP. 18; RGE. 18; PTN. NW1/4 NW1/4; SW1/4 NW1/4 TAX 34 OUT OF TAX 5

**Ownership Information**
- **Current Owner:** CLE ELUM PINES EAST LLC
- **Address:** 1890 NELSON SIDING RD
- **City, State:** CLE ELUM WA
- **Zipcode:** 98922-

### Assessment Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax District</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
<th>Open Space Date</th>
<th>Senior Exemption</th>
<th>Deeded Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>1/1/1978</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Market Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>137,630</td>
<td>137,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perm Crop</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>137,630</td>
<td>137,630</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Taxable Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>19,890</td>
<td>19,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perm Crop</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19,890</td>
<td>19,890</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sales History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Book &amp; Page</th>
<th># Parcels</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06-06-2006</td>
<td>2006-1367</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GREENE, MARK L. ETUX</td>
<td>CLE ELUM PINES EAST LLC</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-01-1991</td>
<td>3130300</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PETHIA ETUX/ANDERSON ETUX</td>
<td>GREENE, MARK L. ETUX</td>
<td>419,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-01-1991</td>
<td>3130200</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PETHIA, DAVID C.</td>
<td>PETHIA ETUX/ANDERSON ETUX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Building Permits

**NO ACTIVE PERMITS!**

### 5 Year Valuation Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Billed Owner</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Impr.</th>
<th>Perm Crop Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>GREENE, MARK L. ETUX</td>
<td>19,890</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19,890</td>
<td>19,890</td>
<td>16,710</td>
<td>16,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>GREENE, MARK L. ETUX</td>
<td>16,710</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,710</td>
<td>16,710</td>
<td>16,710</td>
<td>16,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>GREENE, MARK L. ETUX</td>
<td>16,710</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,710</td>
<td>16,710</td>
<td>16,710</td>
<td>16,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>GREENE, MARK L. ETUX</td>
<td>16,710</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,710</td>
<td>16,710</td>
<td>16,710</td>
<td>16,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>GREENE, MARK L. ETUX</td>
<td>16,710</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,710</td>
<td>16,710</td>
<td>16,710</td>
<td>16,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>GREENE, MARK L. ETUX</td>
<td>17,010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17,010</td>
<td>17,010</td>
<td>17,010</td>
<td>17,010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parcel Comments

NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!

Filedate: 8/17/2006 5:00:00 PM

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/t-assessor.asp?pid=481033
Farm Residence Data Sheet

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 481033
Map Number: 18-18-27020-0002
Situs: UNKNOWN ELLensburg
Legal: ACRES 32.77, CD. 8747; SEC. 27; TWP. 18; RGE. 11; PTN. NW1/4 NW1/4; SW1/4 NW1/4 TAX 34 OUT OF TAX 5
Deeded Acres: 32.77

Ownership Information
Current Owner: CLE ELUM PINES EAST LLC
Address: 1890 NELSON SIDING RD
City, State: CLE ELUM WA
Zipcode: 98922-

Physical Information
Type:
Quality:
Condition:
Arch Type:
Style: error
Exterior Wall: N/A
Floor Area:
Basement Area:
Basement: 0
Finish:
Bedrooms:

Baths:
Plumbing
Fixtures:
Heat Type:
Roof Type:
Garage Type:
Garage Size:
Year Built / Age: /
Effective Age:
Remodel Date:
Remodel Type:

Agrland Information
Class
A7.C2
Type
Use
IRR

# Acres
32.77

Total Acres: 32.77

Site Improvement Information
NO SITE IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Perm Crop Information
NO PERM CROP RECORDS FOUND!

Miscellaneous Improvements
NO MISCELLANEOUS IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/T-Farm.asp?pid=481033&key=5709
8/18/2006
Kittitas County Assessor

205 W 5th Ave Suite 101
Ellensburg, WA 98926
Phone: (509)962-7501
Fax: (509)962-7666

Property Summary (Appraisal Details)

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 11800
Map Number: 18-18-27020-0015
Situs: 02261 VEECER CREEK RD ELLensburg
Legal: ACRES 30.00, CD. 8750-1; SEC. 27; TWP. 18;
RGE. 18; PTN. W1/2 (PARCEL K, B22/P174-175)

Ownership Information
Current Owner: CLE ELUM PINES WEST LLC
Address: 1890 NELSON SIDING RD
City, State: CLE ELUM WA
Zipcode: 98922

Assessment Data
Tax District: 22
Open Space:
Open Space Date:
Senior Exemption:
Deeded Acres:
Last Revaluation for Tax Year:

Market Value
Land: 135,000
Imp: 43,670
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 178,670

Taxable Value
Land: 135,000
Imp: 43,670
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 178,670

Sales History
Date      Book & Page  # Parcels  Grantor            Grantee               Price
12-30-2005 2005-3700  3          GREAT ROUND-UP COWBOY CHURCH CLE ELUM PINES WEST LLC 1,524,397
06-21-2004 53946     8          GREAT ROUNDUP COWBOY CHURCH GREAT ROUND-UP COWBOY CHURCH 150,000
03-01-1997 3405      8          FARM SERVICE AGENCY GREAT ROUNDUP COWBOY CHURCH 272,937
12-01-1993 3729300   27         JEFF GORMAN ETUX FARM SERVICE AGENCY

Building Permits
Permit No.  Date             Description                      Amount
98-04025   4/13/1998         CNEW STORAGE 2880 SF          32,457
97-10044   10/13/1997        AGADD PUMPHOUSE 224 S.F.         4,182

5 Year Valuation Information
Year       Billed Owner        Land  Impr.  PermCrop Value  Total  Exempt  Taxable  Taxes
2006       CLE ELUM PINES EAST LLC 135,000 43,670 0 178,670 178,670 View Taxes
2005       GREAT ROUND-UP COWBOY CHURCH 90,000 33,520 123,520 123,520 View Taxes
2004       GREAT ROUND-UP COWBOY CHURCH 90,000 33,520 123,520 123,520 View Taxes
2003       GREAT ROUND-UP COWBOY CHURCH 90,000 33,520 123,520 123,520 View Taxes

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/t-assessor.asp?pid=11800
8/18/2006
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Land Value</th>
<th>Improvement Value</th>
<th>Total Value</th>
<th>View Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>GREAT ROUND-UP COWBOY CHURCH</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>33,520</td>
<td>123,520</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>GREAT ROUND-UP COWBOY CHURCH</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>22,950</td>
<td>112,950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parcel Comments**

NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!

**Photos/Sketches**

Filedate: 8/17/2006 5:00:00 PM
Farm Residence Data Sheet

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 11800
Map Number: 18-18-27020-0015
Situs: 02281 BREECER CREEK RD ELLensburg
Legal: ACRES 30.00, CD. 8750-1; SEC. 27; TWP. 18;
RGE. 18; PTN. W1/2 (PARCEL K, B22/P174-175)
Deeded Acres: 30

Ownership Information
Current Owner: CLE ELUM PINES WEST LLC
Address: 1890 NELSON SIDING RD
City, State: CLE ELUM WA
Zipcode: 98922

Physical Information
Type: 
Quality: 
Condition: 
Arch Type: 
Style: error
Exterior Wall: N/A
Floor Area: 
Baseement Area: 
Basement: 0
Finish: 
Bedrooms: 

Baths: 
Plumbing 
Fixtures: 
Heat Type: 
Roof Type: 
Garage Type: 
Garage Size: 
Year Built / Age: 
Effective Age: 
Remodel Date: 
Remodel Type: 

Agricultural Information
Class: MKT
Type: OTHER

# Acres
Total Acres: 30

Site Improvement Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Year In</th>
<th># Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POLE</td>
<td>UTILI</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>2880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTST</td>
<td>UtilShdPUMP</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>RFVr RF%33</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>RFVr JOISTS</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLX</td>
<td>WELL</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPTG</td>
<td>Septic,Gravity</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perm Crop Information
NO PERM CROP RECORDS FOUND!

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/T-Farm.asp?pid=11800&key=1179
Miscellaneous Improvements
NO MISCELLANEOUS IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Photos/Sketches

Fildate: 8/17/2006 5:00:00 PM

Kittitas County Assessor

205 W 5th Ave Suite 101
Ellensburg, WA 98926
Phone: (509)962-7501
Fax: (509)962-7666

Property Summary (Appraisal Details)

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 11801
Map Number: 18-18-27020-0016
Situs: VREECER CREEK RD ELLensburg
Legal: ACRES 15.77, CD. 8750-2; SEC. 27, TWP. 18, RGE. 18; PTN. NW1/4; PTN. SW1/4 (PTN. PARCELS F, G & H, B22/P174-175)

Ownership Information
Current Owner: CLE ELUM PINES WEST LLC
Address: 1890 NELSON SIDING RD
City, State: CLE ELUM WA
Zipcode: 98922

Assessment Data
Tax District: 22
Open Space: Land: 119,760
Open Space Perm Crop: 0
Date: Total: 119,760
Senior Exemption: Land: 119,760
Deeded Acres: Imp: 0
Last Revaluation Perm Crop: 0
for Tax Year: Total: 119,760

Market Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Book &amp; Page</th>
<th># Parcels</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12-30-2005</td>
<td>2005-3700</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>GREAT ROUND-UP COWBOY CHURCH</td>
<td>CLE ELUM PINES WEST LLC</td>
<td>1,524,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-21-2004</td>
<td>53946</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>GREAT ROUNDP COWBOY CHURCH</td>
<td>COWBOY CHURCH</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-01-1997</td>
<td>3405</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>FARM SERVICE AGENCY</td>
<td>GREAT ROUNDP COWBOY CHURCH</td>
<td>272,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-01-1993</td>
<td>3723900</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>JEFF GORMAN ETUX</td>
<td>FARM SERVICE AGENCY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sales History

NO ACTIVE PERMITS!

Building Permits

5 Year Valuation Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Billed Owner</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Impr.</th>
<th>PermCrop Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>CLE ELUM PINES EAST LLC</td>
<td>119,760</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>119,760</td>
<td>119,760</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>GREAT ROUND-UP COWBOY CHURCH</td>
<td>73,090</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73,090</td>
<td>73,090</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>GREAT ROUND-UP COWBOY CHURCH</td>
<td>57,370</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57,370</td>
<td>57,370</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>GREAT ROUND-UP COWBOY CHURCH</td>
<td>58,300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58,300</td>
<td>58,300</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>GREAT ROUND-UP COWBOY CHURCH</td>
<td>58,300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58,300</td>
<td>58,300</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifertpublic/t-assessor.asp?pid=11801
8/18/2006
Parcel Comments
NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!

Photos/Sketches

Filedate: 8/17/2006 5:00:00 PM

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifternpublic/t-assessor.asp?pid=11801

8/18/2006
Kittitas County
Assessor

205 W 5th Ave Suite 101
Ellensburg, WA 98926
Phone: (509)962-7501
Fax: (509)962-7666

Farm Residence Data Sheet

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 11801
Map Number: 18-18-27020-0016
Situs: NREECER CREEK RD ELLensburg
Legal: ACRES 15.77, CD. 8750-2; SEC. 27, TWP. 18, RGE. 18; PTN. NW1/4; PTN. SW1/4 (PTN. PARCELS F, G & H, B22/P174-175)
Deeded Acres: 15.77

Ownership Information
Current Owner: CLE ELUM PINES WEST LLC
Address: 1890 NELSON SIDING RD
City, State: CLE ELUM WA
Zipcode: 98922

Physical Information
Type: [missing]
Quality: [missing]
Condition: [missing]
Arch Type: [missing]
Style: [missing]
Exterior Wall: N/A
Floor Area: [missing]
Basement Area: 0
Finish: [missing]
Bedrooms: [missing]
Baths: [missing]
Plumbing: [missing]
Fixtures: [missing]
Heat Type: [missing]
Roof Type: [missing]
Garage Type: [missing]
Garage Size: [missing]
Year Built / Age: [missing]
Effective Age: [missing]
Remodel Date: [missing]
Remodel Type: [missing]

Aglan Information
Class
MKT
MKT

Type
Use
OTHER
OTHER

# Acres
14.77
1
Total Acres: 15.77

Site Improvement Information
NO SITE IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Perm Crop Information
NO PERM CROP RECORDS FOUND!

Miscellaneous Improvements
NO MISCELLANEOUS IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/T-Farm.asp?pid=11801&key=1180
8/18/2006
Property Summary (Appraisal Details)

Parcel Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Number:</th>
<th>11802</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Map Number:</td>
<td>18-18-27020-0017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situs:</td>
<td>IRRECER CREEK RD ELLENSBURG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal:</td>
<td>ACRES 8.00, CD. 8750-3; SEC. 27, TWP. 18, RGE. 18; PTN. NW1/4 (PTN. PARCELS G &amp; H, B22/P174-175)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ownership Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Owner:</th>
<th>CLE ELUM PINES WEST LLC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>1890 NELSON SIDING RD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, State:</td>
<td>CLE ELUM WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zipcode:</td>
<td>98922</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax District:</th>
<th>22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open Space:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Exemption:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deeded Acres:</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Revaluation for Tax Year:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Market Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land: 82,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imp: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perm Crop: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: 82,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taxable Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land: 82,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imp: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perm Crop: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: 82,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sales History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Book &amp; Page</th>
<th># Parcels</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12-30-2005</td>
<td>2005-3700</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>GREAT ROUND-UP COWBOY CHURCH</td>
<td>CLE ELUM PINES WEST LLC</td>
<td>1,524,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-21-2004</td>
<td>53946</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>GREAT ROUNDUP COWBOY CHURCH</td>
<td>GREAT ROUND-UP COWBOY CHURCH</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-01-1997</td>
<td>3405</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>FARM SERVICE AGENCY</td>
<td>FARM SERVICE AGENCY</td>
<td>272,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-01-1993</td>
<td>3729300</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>JEFF GORMAN ETUX</td>
<td>CLE ELUM PINES WEST LLC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Building Permits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000-04041</td>
<td>4/24/2000</td>
<td>RALT SEE COMMEN RALT</td>
<td>109,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98-01043</td>
<td>1/30/1998</td>
<td>EXP HOUSE RALT 3000</td>
<td>29,938</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Year Valuation Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Billed Owner</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Impr.</th>
<th>PermCrop Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>CLE ELUM PINES EAST LLC</td>
<td>82,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>82,000</td>
<td>82,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>BURKE, TIMOTHY J ETUX</td>
<td>50,950</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,950</td>
<td>50,950</td>
<td></td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>BURKE, TIMOTHY J ETUX</td>
<td>73,870</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73,870</td>
<td>73,870</td>
<td></td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>BURKE, TIMOTHY J ETUX</td>
<td>63,220</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63,220</td>
<td>63,220</td>
<td></td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>BURKE, TIMOTHY J ETUX</td>
<td>63,220</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63,220</td>
<td>63,220</td>
<td></td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Filedate: 8/17/2006 5:00:00 PM
Farm Residence Data Sheet

Parcel Information

Parcel Number: 11802
Map Number: 18-18-27020-0017
Situs: WREECER CREEK RD ELLensburg
Legal: ACRES 8.00, CD. 8750-3; SEC. 27, TWP. 18, RGE. 18; PTN. NW1/4 (PTN. PARCELS G & H, B22/P174-175)
Deeded Acres: 8

Ownership Information

Current Owner: CLE ELUM PINES WEST LLC
Address: 1890 NELSON SIDING RD
City, State: CLE ELUM WA
Zipcode: 98922

Physical Information

Type:
Quality:
Condition:
Arch Type:
Style: error
Exterior Wall: N/A
Floor Area:
Basement Area:
Basement: 0
Finish:
Bedrooms:

Baths:
Plumbing:
Fixtures:
Heat Type:
Roof Type:
Garage Type:
Garage Size:
Year Built / Age:
Effective Age:
Remodel Date:
Remodel Type:

Agland Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th># Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MKT</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MKT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Acres: 8

Site Improvement Information

NO SITE IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Perm Crop Information

NO PERM CROP RECORDS FOUND!

Miscellaneous Improvements

NO MISCELLANEOUS IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!
## Property Summary

### Parcel Information
- **Parcel Number:** 621033
- **Map Number:** 18-18-28000-0040
- **Situs:** 02516 W DRY CREEK RD ELLENSBURG ACRES 192.16, CD. 8774; SEC. 28; TWP. 18; RGE. 18; PTN NE1/4 N OF DRY CR RD & PTN E1/2 L YS OF DRY CR RD & N OF SR 10 LESS 6.97 @ CO. RD.; 2.87 @ STATE RD.; 6.30 STATE OF WA JOHN WAYNE TRAIL

### Ownership Information
- **Current Owner:** TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC
- **Address:** 1890 NELSON SIDING RD
- **City, State:** CLE ELUM WA
- **Zipcode:** 98922

### Assessment Data
- **Tax District:** 22
- **Open Space:** YES
- **Open Space Date:** 1/1/1978
- **Senior Exemption:**
- **Deeded Acres:** 192.16
- **Last Revaluation for Tax Year:**

### Market Value
- **Land:** 707,010
- **Imp:** 189,150
- **Perm Crop:** 0
- **Total:** 896,160

### Taxable Value
- **Land:** 135,360
- **Imp:** 189,150
- **Perm Crop:** 0
- **Total:** 324,510

### Sales History
- **Date:** 06-06-2006
- **Book & Page:** 2006-1368
- **# Parcels:** 2
- **Grantee:** TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC
- **Grantor:** GREENE, MARK L. ETUX

- **Date:** 01-01-1991
- **Book & Page:** 3130300
- **# Parcels:** 2
- **Grantee:** GREENE, MARK L. ETUX
- **Grantor:** PETHIA ETUX/ANDERSON ETUX

- **Date:** 01-01-1991
- **Book & Page:** 3130200
- **# Parcels:** 2
- **Grantee:** PETHIA ETUX/ANDERSON ETUX
- **Grantor:** BEAVER, DAVID C.

### Building Permits
- **Permit No.:** 95-08035
- **Date:** 8/14/1995
- **Description:** RADD 1900 S.F.
- **Amount:** 9,234

### 5 Year Valuation Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Billed Owner</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Impr.</th>
<th>PermCrop</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>GREENE, MARK L. ETUX</td>
<td>135,360</td>
<td>189,150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>324,510</td>
<td>324,510</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>GREENE, MARK L. ETUX</td>
<td>115,260</td>
<td>148,830</td>
<td>264,090</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>GREENE, MARK L. ETUX</td>
<td>115,260</td>
<td>148,830</td>
<td>264,090</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>GREENE, MARK L. ETUX</td>
<td>115,260</td>
<td>148,830</td>
<td>264,090</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>GREENE, MARK L. ETUX</td>
<td>115,260</td>
<td>148,830</td>
<td>264,090</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>GREENE, MARK L. ETUX</td>
<td>134,780</td>
<td>143,070</td>
<td>277,850</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/t-assessor.asp?pid=621033

8/18/2006
Parcel Comments
NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!

Photos/Sketches

Filedate: 8/17/2006 5:00:00 PM
Farm Residence Data Sheet

Parcel Information

Parcel Number: 621033
Map Number: 18-18-28000-0040
Situs: 02516 W DRY CREEK RD ELLensburg
Legal: ACREs 192.16, CD. 8774; SEC. 2B; TWP. 18;
RGE. 18; PTN NE1/4 N OF DRY CR RD & PTN
E1/2 LY S OF DRY CR RD & N OF SR 10 LESS
6.97 @ CO. RD.; 2.87 @ STATE RD.; 6.30 STATE
OF WA JOHN WAYNE TRAIL

Deeded Acres: 192.16

Ownership Information

Current Owner: TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC
Address: 1890 NELSON SIDING RD
City, State: CLE ELUM WA
Zipcode: 98922

Physical Information

Type: Single Family (1)
Quality: Fair
Condition: Average
Arch Type: One Story (1) 100 %
Exterior Wall: 100 % Hardboard
Floor Area: 2004
Basement Area: 0
Basement Finish: 
Bedrooms: 

Baths: 
Plumbing: 5
Fixtures: 
Heat Type: Baseboard Electric (7)
Roof Type: 
Garage Type: 
Garage Size: 
Year Built / Age: 1920 / 86
Effective Age: 86
Remodel Age: 
Remodel Type: 

Agland Information

Class 

Type 

Use 

# Acres 

C11 

RANGE 

147.16

A7.C1 

IRRG 

39

A7.C2 

HOME 

1

C13 

Total Acres: 192.16

Site Improvement Information

Code 

UTST 

RPO 

DTG 

UTST 

PCO 

FLX 

SPTG 

Description 

UtilShd 12X24 

CvWdPor 

DetGar 14X24 S O 

UtilShd 

Concrete 

WELL 

Septic,Gravity 

Year In 

1920 

1920 

1980 

1920 

1987 

1987 

1987

# Units 

288 

140 

336 

224 

368

1

1

8/18/2006
Perm Crop Information
NO PERM CROP RECORDS FOUND!

Miscellaneous Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CrpFIRf</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Photos/Sketches

Filedate: 8/17/2006 5:00:00 PM
Kittitas County
Assessor

205 W 5th Ave Suite 101
Ellensburg, WA 98926
Phone: (509)962-7501
Fax: (509)962-7666

Farm Residence Data Sheet

Parcel Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Number: 621033</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Map Number: 18-18-28000-0040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situs: 02516 W DRY CREEK RD ELLENSBURG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal: ACRES 192.16, CD. 8774; SEC. 28; TWP. 18; RGE. 18; PTN NE1/4 N OF DRY CR RD &amp; PTN E1/2 LY S OF DRY CR RD &amp; N OF SR 10 LESS 6.97 @ CO. RD.; 2.87 @ STATE RD.; 6.30 STATE OF WA JOHN WAYNE TRAIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deeded Acres: 192.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ownership Information

| Current Owner: TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC |
| Address: 1890 NELSON SIDING RD |
| City, State: CLE ELUM WA |
| Zipcode: 98922- |

Physical Information

| Type: |
| Quality: |
| Condition: |
| Arch Type: |
| Style: error |
| Exterior Wall: N/A |
| Floor Area: |
| Basement Area: 0 |
| Basement Finish: |
| Bedrooms: 4 |
| Baths: |
| Plumbing: |
| Fixtures: |
| Heat Type: |
| Roof Type: |
| Garage Type: |
| Garage Size: |
| Year Built / Age: / |
| Effective Age: |
| Remodel Date: |
| Remodel Type: |

Agland Information
NO AGLAND RECORDS FOUND!

Site Improvement Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Year In</th>
<th># Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAYS</td>
<td>HayCvr</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>4400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCLT</td>
<td>HayCvrWng 2ND WN</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCLT</td>
<td>HayCvrWng</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTIL</td>
<td>UtilBdg</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>2520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPS</td>
<td>MachShd</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>2220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTG</td>
<td>DetGar BY GBN</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTST</td>
<td>UtilShd</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBIN</td>
<td>GrainBin 17HT 1</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTST</td>
<td>UtilShd E SIDE D</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCLT</td>
<td>HayCvrWng BARN W</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>2440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perm Crop Information
NO PERM CROP RECORDS FOUND!

Miscellaneous Improvements
NO MISCELLANEOUS IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Photos/Sketches

Filedate: 8/17/2006 5:00:00 PM
Kittitas County Assessor
205 W 5th Ave Suite 101
Ellensburg, WA 98926
Phone: (509)962-7501
Fax: (509)962-7666

Farm Residence Data Sheet

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 621033
Map Number: 18-18-28000-0040
Situs: 02518 W DRY CREEK RD ELLensburg
Legal: ACRES 192.16, CD. 8774; SEC. 28; TWP. 18;
RGE. 18; PTN NE1/4 N OF DRY CR RD & PTN
E1/2 LS OF DRY CR RD & N OF SR 10 LESS
6.87 @ CO. RD.; 2.87 @ STATE RD.; 6.30 STATE
OF WA JOHN WAYNE TRAIL
Deeded Acres: 192.16

Ownership Information
Current Owner: TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC
Address: 1890 NELSON SIDING RD
City, State: CLE ELUM WA
Zipcode: 98922

Physical Information
Type: Mobile Home (4)
Quality: Average
Condition: Very Good
Arch Type:
Style: One Story (1) 100 %
Exterior Wall: 100 % N/A
Floor Area: 1536
Basement Area:
Basement: 0
Finish:
Bedrooms:

Baths:
Plumbing
Fixtures:
Heat Type: Forced Air (1)
Roof Type:
Garage Type:
Garage Size:
Year Built / Age: 1976 / 30
Effective Age: 30
Remodel Date:
Remodel Type:

Agland Information
NO AGLAND RECORDS FOUND!

Site Improvement Information
NO SITE IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Perm Crop Information
NO PERM CROP RECORDS FOUND!

Miscellaneous Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOOD STOVE</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1Cvr24x4x0</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wd Deck12x8x0</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELL</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/T-Farm.asp?pid=621033&key=6551

8/18/2006
Kittitas County Assessor

206 W 5th Ave Suite 101
Ellensburg, WA 98926
Phone: (509)962-7501
Fax: (509)962-7666

Property Summary (Appraisal Details)

Parcel Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Number: 792534</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Map Number: 20-14-12022-0008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situs: ISR 803 RONALD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal: ACRES 56.74, CD. 5862-E; SEC. 12, TWP. 20, RGE. 14; PTN. N1/2 (PTN-LOT 2A, B32/P134-137) (MUST BE SOLD WITH 20-14-01030-0020)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ownership Information

| Current Owner: TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC |
| Address: PO BOX 808 |
| City, State: CLE ELUM WA |
| Zipcode: 98922- |

Assessment Data

| Tax District: 40 |
| Open Space: |
| Open Space Date: |
| Senior Exemption: |
| Deeded Acres: 56.74 |
| Last Revaluation for Tax Year: |

Market Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imp: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perm Crop: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taxable Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imp: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perm Crop: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sales History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Book &amp; Page</th>
<th># Parcels</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06-20-2006</td>
<td>2006-1501</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>PINE TREE LLC</td>
<td>TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC</td>
<td>399,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-01-2006</td>
<td>2006-1293</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC</td>
<td>ANKROM, JAMES E ETUX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-11-2003</td>
<td>19253</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Building Permits

NO ACTIVE PERMITS!

5 Year Valuation Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Billed Owner</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Impr.</th>
<th>PermCrop</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC</td>
<td>163,730</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>163,730</td>
<td></td>
<td>163,730</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC</td>
<td>163,730</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>163,730</td>
<td></td>
<td>163,730</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC</td>
<td>163,730</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>163,730</td>
<td></td>
<td>163,730</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC</td>
<td>179,330</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>179,330</td>
<td></td>
<td>179,330</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC</td>
<td>173,160</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>173,160</td>
<td></td>
<td>173,160</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC</td>
<td>173,160</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>173,160</td>
<td></td>
<td>173,160</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parcel Comments

NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!

http://www.kittitas.wa.us/taxsetterpublic/t-assessor.asp?pid=792534

8/18/2006
Residential Data Sheet

Parcel Information

Parcel Number: 792534
Map Number: 20-14-12022-0008
Situs: ISR 903 RONALD
Legal: ACRES 56.74, CD. 5862-E; SEC. 12, TWP. 20, RGE. 14; PTN. N1/2 (PTN-LOT 2A, B32/P134-137) (MUST BE SOLD WITH 20-14-01030-0020~)

Ownership Information

Current Owner: TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC
Address: PO BOX 808
City, State: CLE ELUM WA
Zipcode: 98922-

Lot Information

Topography: SGS
Amenities: VV/TOP/ESMT SITE/IMP/CLUB
Lot Width: Lot Depth:

Street Access: PPY W
Utilities: NXXXX
Deeded Acres: 56.74

Physical Information

Type:
Quality:
Condition:
Arch Type:
Style: error
Exterior Wall: N/A
Floor Area:
Basement Area:
Basement: 0
Finish:
Bedrooms:

Baths:
Plumbing
Fixtures:
Heat Type:
Roof Type:
Garage Type:
Garage Size:
Year Built / Age: /
Effective Age:
Remodel Date:
Remodel Type:

Miscellaneous Improvements

NO MISCELLANEOUS IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Filedate: 8/17/2006 5:00:00 PM

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsiferpublic/T-Resident.asp?pid=792534&key=19601

8/18/2006
Kittitas County Assessor

205 W 5th Ave Suite 101
Ellensburg, WA 98926
Phone: (509)962-7501
Fax: (509)962-7666

Property Summary (Appraisal Details)

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 582534
Map Number: 20-14-12010-0002
Situs:
Legal: ACRES 34.84, CD. 5856; SEC. 12; TWP. 20; RGE. 14; PTN SW1/4 NE 1/4 TAX 4

Ownership Information
Current Owner: TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC
Address: 1890 NELSON SIDING RD
City, State: CLE ELUM WA
Zipcode: 98922

Assessment Data
Tax District: 31
Open Space: YES
Open Space Date: 1/1/1975
Senior Exemption:
Deeded Acres: 34.84

Market Value
Land: 2,330
Imp: 0
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 2,330

Taxable Value
Land: 2,330
Imp: 0
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 2,330

Sales History
Date: 10-29-2004
Book & Page: 2004-2735
# Parcels: 4
Grantor: BOISE CASCADE CORPORATION
Grantee: TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC
Price:

Building Permits
NO ACTIVE PERMITS!

5 Year Valuation Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Billed Owner</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Imp.</th>
<th>PermCrop Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC</td>
<td>2,330</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,330</td>
<td>2,330</td>
<td>2,330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,410</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,410</td>
<td>2,410</td>
<td>2,410</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,530</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,530</td>
<td>2,530</td>
<td>2,530</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,640</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,640</td>
<td>2,640</td>
<td>2,640</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,710</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,710</td>
<td>2,710</td>
<td>2,710</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,850</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,850</td>
<td>2,850</td>
<td>2,850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parcel Comments
NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/t-assessor.asp?pid=582534
8/18/2006
Kittitas County Assessor

205 W 5th Ave Suite 101
Ellensburg, WA 98926
Phone: (509)962-7501
Fax: (509)962-7666

Farm Residence Data Sheet

Parcel Information

- **Parcel Number:** 582534
- **Map Number:** 20-14-12010-0002
- **Situs:**
- **Legal:** ACRES 34.84, CD. 5856; SEC. 12; TWP. 20; RGE. 14; PTN SW1/4 NE 1/4 TAX 4
- **Deeded Acres:** 34.84

Ownership Information

- **Current Owner:** TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC
- **Address:** 1890 NELSON SIDING RD
- **City, State:** CLE ELUM WA
- **Zipcode:** 98922

Physical Information

- **Type:** 
- **Quality:** 
- **Condition:** 
- **Arch Type:** 
- **Style:** error
- **Exterior Wall:** N/A
- **Floor Area:** 
- **Basement Area:** 
- **Basement:** 0
- **Finish:** 
- **Bedrooms:** 
- **Baths:**
- **Plumbing:** 
- **Fixtures:** 
- **Heat Type:** 
- **Roof Type:** 
- **Garage Type:** 
- **Garage Size:** 
- **Year Built / Age:** / 
- **Effective Age:** 
- **Remodel Date:** 
- **Remodel Type:**

Agland Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th># Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T5-3</td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Acres: 34.84

Site Improvement Information

NO SITE IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Perm Crop Information

NO PERM CROP RECORDS FOUND!

Miscellaneous Improvements

NO MISCELLANEOUS IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Filedate: 8/17/2006 5:00:00 PM

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/T-Farm.asp?pid=582534&key=10980

8/18/2006
Kittitas County Assessor

205 W 5th Ave Suite 101
Ellensburg, WA 98926
Phone: (509)862-7501
Fax: (509)862-7656

Farm Residence Data Sheet

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 725535
Map Number: 20-17-26000-0001
Situs:
Legal: ACRES 640.00, CD. 7724; SEC. 26; TWP. 20; RGE. 17; ALL SECTION
Deeded Acres: 640

Ownership Information
Current Owner: AMERICAN FOREST RESOURCES LLC
% TIMBER RESOURCE SERVICES LLC
Address: 6400 HIGHWAY 66
City, State: KLAMATH FALLS OR
Zipcode: 97601

Physical Information
Type:
Quality:
Condition:
Arch Type:
Style: error
Exterior Wall: N/A
Floor Area:
Basement Area:
Basement Finish:
Bedrooms:

Baths:
Plumbing:
Fixtures:
Heat Type:
Roof Type:
Garage Type:
Garage Size:
Year Built / Age:
Effective Age:
Remodel Date:
Remodel Type:

Agland Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th># Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T6-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Acres: 640

Site Improvement Information
NO SITE IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Perm Crop Information
NO PERM CROP RECORDS FOUND!

Miscellaneous Improvements
NO MISCELLANEOUS IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/T-Farm.asp?pid=725535&key=11214

8/14/2006
Property Summary

Parcel Information
- Parcel Number: 725535
- Map Number: 20-17-26000-0001
- Situs:
- Legal: ACRES 640.00, CD. 7724; SEC. 26; TWP. 20; RGE. 17; ALL SECTION

Ownership Information
- Current Owner: AMERICAN FOREST RESOURCES LLC
- Address: 6400 HIGHWAY 66
- City, State: KLAMATH FALLS OR
- Zipcode: 97601

Assessment Data
- Tax District: 32
- Open Space: YES
- Open Space Date: 1/1/1975
- Senior Exemption:
- Deeded Acres: 640
- Last Valuation for Tax Year:

Market Value
- Land: 19,390
- Imp: 0
- Perm Crop: 0
- Total: 19,390

Taxable Value
- Land: 19,390
- Imp: 0
- Perm Crop: 0
- Total: 19,390

Sales History
- NO SALES HISTORY RECORDS FOUND!

Building Permits
- NO ACTIVE PERMITS!

5 Year Valuation Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Billed Owner</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Impr.</th>
<th>Perm Crop Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>AMERICAN FOREST RESOURCES LLC</td>
<td>19,390</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19,390</td>
<td>19,390</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>19,960</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19,960</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>20,530</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20,530</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>21,110</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21,110</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>21,680</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21,680</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>22,780</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22,780</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parcel Comments
- NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!

Filedate: 8/10/2006 5:11:24 PM

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxesfterpublic/t-assessor.asp?pid=725535

8/14/2006
Farm Residence Data Sheet

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 367635
Map Number: 21-16-30040-0001
Situs: 
Legal: ACRES 431.82, CD. 6940; SEC. 30; TWP. 21; RGE. 16; NE1/4; N1/2 SW1/4; SE1/4 SW1/4; SE1/4 LESS TAX 1; LESS 1.50@ COUNTY ROAD
Deeded Acres: 431.82

Ownership Information
Current Owner: AMERICAN FOREST RESOURCES LLC % TIMBER RESOURCE SERVICES LLC
Address: 6400 HIGHWAY 66
City, State: KLAMATH FALLS OR
Zipcode: 97601

Physical Information
Type:
Quality:
Condition:
Arch Type:
Style: error
Exterior Wall: N/A
Floor Area:
Basement Area:
Basement Finish: 0
Bedrooms:

Baths:
Plumbing:
Fixtures:
Heat Type:
Roof Type:
Garage Type:
Garage Size:
Year Built / Age:
Effective Age:
Remodel Date:
Remodel Type:

Agriculture Information
Class
T5-2
T6-2
T6-3
T8-1
Type
TIMBER
TIMBER
TIMBER
TIMBER
# Acres
190.82
104
34
103
Total Acres: 431.82

Site Improvement Information
NO SITE IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Perm Crop Information
NO PERM CROP RECORDS FOUND!

Miscellaneous Improvements
NO MISCELLANEOUS IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/T-Farm.asp?pid=367635&key=10614 8/14/2006
Kittitas County Assessor

206 W 5th Ave Suite 101
Ellensburg, WA 98926
Phone: (509)962-7501
Fax: (509)962-7666

Property Summary
(Appraisal Details)

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 367635
Map Number: 21-16-30040-0001
Situs:
Legal: ACRES 431.82, CD. 6940; SEC. 30; TWP. 21;
RGE. 1E; NE1/4; N1/2 SW1/4; SE1/4 SW1/4; SE1/4
LESS TAX 1; LESS 1.50 @ COUNTY ROAD

Ownership Information
Current Owner: AMERICAN FOREST RESOURCES LLC
% TIMBER RESOURCE SERVICES LLC
Address: 6400 HIGHWAY 66
City, State: Klamath Falls OR
Zipcode: 97601

Assessment Data
Tax District: 32
Open Space: YES
Open Space Date: 1/1/1975
Senior Exemption:
Deeded Acres: 431.82
Last Revaluation for Tax Year:

Market Value
Land: 17,910
Imp: 0
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 17,910

Taxable Value
Land: 17,910
Imp: 0
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 17,910

Sales History
NO SALES HISTORY RECORDS FOUND!

Building Permits
NO ACTIVE PERMITS!

5 Year Valuation Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Billed Owner</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Impr.</th>
<th>PermCrop Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>American Forest Resources LLC</td>
<td>17,910</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17,910</td>
<td>17,910</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>18,420</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>18,420</td>
<td>18,420</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,140</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,140</td>
<td>19,140</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,840</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,840</td>
<td>19,840</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,370</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,370</td>
<td>20,370</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>21,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>21,400</td>
<td>21,400</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parcel Comments
NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsiferpublic/t-assessor.asp?pid=367635

8/14/2006
# Farm Residence Data Sheet

## Parcel Information
- **Parcel Number:** 357635
- **Map Number:** 21-16-30000-0001
- **Legal:** ACRES 183.87, CD. 6941-1; SEC. 30, TWP. 21, RGE. 16 NW1/4; SW1/4 SW1/4
- **Deeded Acres:** 183.87

## Ownership Information
- **Current Owner:** AMERICAN FOREST RESOURCES LLC
- **Address:** 6400 HIGHWAY 66
- **City, State:** KLAMATH FALLS OR
- **Zipcode:** 97601

## Physical Information
- **Type:** error
- **Quality:**
- **Condition:**
- **Arch Type:**
- **Style:**
- **Exterior Wall:** N/A
- **Floor Area:**
- **Basement Area:**
- **Basement Finish:**
- **Bedrooms:**
- **Baths:**
  - Plumbing
  - Fixtures:
- **Heat Type:**
- **Roof Type:**
- **Garage Type:**
- **Garage Size:**
- **Year Built / Age:** /
- **Effective Age:**
- **Remodel Date:**
- **Remodel Type:**

## Agland Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th># Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T5-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>68.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>111.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Acres:** 183.87

## Site Improvement Information
NO SITE IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

## Perm Crop Information
NO PERM CROP RECORDS FOUND!

## Miscellaneous Improvements
NO MISCELLANEOUS IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!
Property Summary (Appraisal Details)

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 357635
Map Number: 21-16-30000-0001
Situs:
Legal: ACRES 183.87, CD. 6941-1; SEC. 30, TWP. 21, RGE. 16 NW1/4; SW1/4 SW1/4

Ownership Information
Current Owner: AMERICAN FOREST RESOURCES LLC
Address: 6400 HIGHWAY 66
City, State: KLAMATH FALLS OR
Zipcode: 97601

Assessment Data
Tax District: 32
Open Space: YES
Open Space Date: 1/1/1983
Senior Exemption:
Deeded Acres: 183.87
Last Revaluation for Tax Year:

Market Value
Land: 8,760
Imp: 0
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 8,760

Taxable Value
Land: 8,760
Imp: 0
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 8,760

Sales History
NO SALES HISTORY RECORDS FOUND!

Building Permits
NO ACTIVE PERMITS!

5 Year Valuation Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Billed Owner</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Impr.</th>
<th>PermCrop Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>AMERICAN FOREST RESOURCES LLC</td>
<td>8,760</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,760</td>
<td>8,760</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,010</td>
<td>9,010</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,340</td>
<td>9,340</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,660</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,660</td>
<td>9,660</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,910</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,910</td>
<td>9,910</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,430</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,430</td>
<td>10,430</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parcel Comments
NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!

Filedate: 8/10/2006 5:11:24 PM

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxifertpublic/t-assessor.asp?pid=357635
Farm Residence Data Sheet

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 857635
Map Number: 21-16-33000-001
Situs:
Legal: ACRES 640.00, CD. 6965; SEC. 33; TWP. 21; RGE. 16; ALL SECTION;
Deeded Acres: 640

Ownership Information
Current Owner: AMERICAN FOREST RESOURCES LLC
Address: 6400 HIGHWAY 66
City, State: KLAMATH FALLS OR
Zipcode: 97601

Physical Information
Type:
Quality:
Condition:
Arch Type:
Style: error
Exterior Wall: N/A
Floor Area:
Basement Area:
Basement Finish: 0
Bedrooms:
Baths:
Plumbing:
Fixtures:
Heat Type:
Roof Type:
Garage Type:
Garage Size:
Year Built / Age: / 
Effective Age:
Remodel Date:
Remodel Type:

Agland Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th># Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T5-2</td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5-3</td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6-3</td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7-2</td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8-1</td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Acres: 640</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site Improvement Information
NO SITE IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Perm Crop Information
NO PERM CROP RECORDS FOUND!

Miscellaneous Improvements
NO MISCELLANEOUS IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsiferpublic/T-Farm.asp?pid=857635&key=11384
8/14/2006
# Kittitas County Assessor

205 W 5th Ave Suite 101
Ellensburg, WA 98926
Phone: (509)962-7501
Fax: (509)962-7666

## Property Summary

### Parcel Information
- **Parcel Number:** 857635
- **Map Number:** 21-16-33000-0001
- **Situs:**
  - **Legal:** ACRES 640.00, CD. 6965; SEC. 33; TWP. 21; RGE. 16; ALL SECTION;

### Ownership Information
- **Current Owner:** AMERICAN FOREST RESOURCES LLC
- **Address:** 6400 HIGHWAY 86
- **City, State:** KLAMATH FALLS OR
- **Zipcode:** 97601

### Assessment Data
- **Tax District:** 32
- **Open Space:** YES
- **Open Space Date:** 1/1/1975
- **Taxable Value:**
  - **Land:** 31,050
  - **Imp:** 0
  - **Perm Crop:** 0
  - **Total:** 31,050

### Market Value
- **Land:** 31,050
- **Imp:** 0
- **Perm Crop:** 0
- **Total:** 31,050

### Sales History
- **NO SALES HISTORY RECORDS FOUND!**

### Building Permits
- **NO ACTIVE PERMITS!**

### 5 Year Valuation Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Billed Owner</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Impr.</th>
<th>PermCrop Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>AMERICAN FOREST RESOURCES LLC</td>
<td>31,050</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31,050</td>
<td>31,050</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>31,980</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>31,980</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>33,230</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>33,230</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>34,470</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>34,470</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td>35,410</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>35,410</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>37,240</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>37,240</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parcel Comments
- **NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!**

Filedate: 8/10/2006 5:11:24 PM

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/t-assessor.asp?pid=857635

8/14/2006
Miscellaneous Improvements
NO MISCELLANEOUS IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Filedate: 8/10/2006 5:11:24 PM

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/T-Farm.asp?pid=347635&key=10580

8/14/2006
Farm Residence Data Sheet

Parcel Information

Parcel Number: 347635
Map Number: 21-16-29000-0001
Situs:
Legal: ACRES 638.5, CD. 6939; SEC. 29; TWP. 21; RGE. 16; ALL FRACTIONAL; LESS 1.50@ COUNTY ROAD
Deeded Acres: 638.5

Ownership Information

Current Owner: AMERICAN FOREST RESOURCES LLC % TIMBER RESOURCE SERVICES LLC
Address: 6400 HIGHWAY 66
City, State: KLAMATH FALLS OR
Zipcode: 97601

Physical Information

Type:
Quality:
Condition:
Arch Type:
Style: error
Exterior Wall: N/A
Floor Area:
Basement Area:
Basement: 0
Finish:
Bedrooms:

Baths: plumbing
Fixtures:
Heat Type:
Roof Type:
Garage Type:
Garage Size:
Year Built / Age:
Effective Age:
Remodel Date:
Remodel Type:

Agland Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th># Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T5-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>267.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Acres: 638.5

Site Improvement Information

NO SITE IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Perm Crop Information

NO PERM CROP RECORDS FOUND!
**Property Summary (Appraisal Details)**

**Parcel Information**
- Parcel Number: 347635
- Map Number: 21-16-290000-0001
- Situs:
- Legal: ACRES 638.50, CD. 6939; SEC. 29; TWP. 21; RGE. 16; ALL FRACTIONAL; LESS 1.50@ COUNTY ROAD

**Ownership Information**
- Current Owner: AMERICAN FOREST RESOURCES LLC
  % TIMBER RESOURCE SERVICES LLC
- Address: 6400 HIGHWAY 66
- City, State: Klamath Falls OR
- Zipcode: 97601

**Assessment Data**
- Tax District: 32
- Open Space: YES
- Open Space Date: 1/1/1975
- Senior Exemption: 
- Deeded Acres: 638.5
- Last Revaluation for Tax Year:

**Market Value**
- Land: 28,470
- Imp: 0
- Perm Crop: 0
- Total: 28,470

**Taxable Value**
- Land: 28,470
- Imp: 0
- Perm Crop: 0
- Total: 28,470

**Sales History**
NO SALES HISTORY RECORDS FOUND!

**Building Permits**
NO ACTIVE PERMITS!

**5 Year Valuation Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Billed Owner</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Impr.</th>
<th>PermCrop Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>AMERICAN FOREST RESOURCES LLC</td>
<td>28,470</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28,470</td>
<td>28,470</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>29,300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29,300</td>
<td></td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>30,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,400</td>
<td></td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>31,530</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31,530</td>
<td></td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td>32,360</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32,360</td>
<td></td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>34,020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34,020</td>
<td></td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parcel Comments**
NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/t-assessor.asp?pid=347635

8/14/2006
NO MISCELLANEOUS IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Filedate: 8/10/2006 5:11:24 PM
Kittitas County
Assessor

205 W 5th Ave Suite 101
Ellensburg, WA 98926
Phone: (509)962-7501
Fax: (509)962-7666

Farm Residence Data Sheet

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 337635
Map Number: 21-16-28000-0001
Situs: 
Legal: ACRES 640.00, CD. 6938; SEC. 28; TWP. 21; 
RGE. 16; ALL SECTION;
Deeded Acres: 640

Ownership Information
Current Owner: AMERICAN FOREST RESOURCES LLC
% TIMBER RESOURCE SERVICES LLC
Address: 6400 HIGHWAY 66
City, State: KLASATH FALLS OR
Zipcode: 97601

Physical Information
Type: 
Quality: 
Condition: 
Arch Type: 
Style: error
Exterior Wall: N/A
Floor Area: 
Basement Area: 
Basement 0
Finish: 
Bedrooms:

Baths: 
Plumbing 
Fixtures: 
Heat Type: 
Roof Type: 
Garage Type: 
Garage Size: 
Year Built / Age: /
Effective Age: 
Remodel Date: 
Remodel Type:

Agricultural Information
Class
T5-2
T5-3
T8-3
T7-2
T7-3
T8-1

Type
Use
TIMBER
TIMBER
TIMBER
TIMBER
TIMBER
TIMBER

# Acres
115
209
185
70
42
19

Total Acres: 640

Site Improvement Information
NO SITE IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Perm Crop Information
NO PERM CROP RECORDS FOUND!

Miscellaneous Improvements

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxiserverpublic/T-Farm.asp?pid=337635&key=10563
8/14/2006
Kittitas County Assessor

Property Summary (Appraisal Details)

Parcel Information

Parcel Number: 337635
Map Number: 21-16-28000-0001
Situs: ACRES 640.00, CD. 6938; SEC. 28; TWP. 21;
RGE. 16; ALL SECTION;

Ownership Information

Current Owner: AMERICAN FOREST RESOURCES LLC
Address: 6400 HIGHWAY 66
City, State: KLAMATH FALLS OR
Zipcode: 97601

Assessment Data

Tax District: 32
Open Space: YES
Open Space Date: 1/1/1975
Senior Exemption: No
Deeded Acres: 640
Last Revaluation for Tax Year: 2006

Market Value

Land: 30,180
Imp: 0
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 30,180

Taxable Value

Land: 30,180
Imp: 0
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 30,180

Sales History

NO SALES HISTORY RECORDS FOUND!

Building Permits

NO ACTIVE PERMITS!

5 Year Valuation Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Billed Owner</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Impr.</th>
<th>PermCrop Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>AMERICAN FOREST RESOURCES LLC</td>
<td>30,180</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,180</td>
<td>30,180</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>31,120</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31,120</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>32,410</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32,410</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>33,670</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33,670</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td>34,610</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34,610</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>36,390</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36,390</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parcel Comments

NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!

Filedate: 8/10/2006 5:11:24 PM

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/t-assessor.asp?pid=337635

8/14/2006
Farm Residence Data Sheet

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 687535
Map Number: 21-15-35000-0003
Situs:
Legal: ACRES 640.00, CD. 6442; SEC. 35; TWP. 21;
RGE. 15; ALL SECTION
Deeded Acres: 640

Ownership Information
Current Owner: AMERICAN FOREST RESOURCES LLC
% TIMBER RESOURCE SERVICES LLC
Address: 6400 HIGHWAY 66
City, State: KLAMATH FALLS OR
Zipcode: 97601

Physical Information
Type:
Quality:
Condition:
Arch Type:
Style: error
Exterior Wall: N/A
Floor Area:
Basement Area:
Basement: 0
Finish:
Bedrooms:
Baths:
Plumbing:
Fixtures:
Heat Type:
Roof Type:
Garage Type:
Garage Size:
Year Built / Age: /
Effective Age:
Remodel Date:
Remodel Type:

Agrain Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th># Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T5-2</td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5-3</td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8-2</td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8-3</td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8-1</td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Acres: 640

Site Improvement Information
NO SITE IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Perm Crop Information
NO PERM CROP RECORDS FOUND!

Miscellaneous Improvements
NO MISCELLANEOUS IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsiferpublic/T-Farm.asp?pid=687535&key=11152 8/14/2006
Kittitas County Assessor

Property Summary (Appraisal Details)

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 687535
Map Number: 21-15-35000-0003
Situs:
Legal: ACRES 640.00, CD. 6442; SEC. 35; TWP. 21;
RGE. 15; ALL SECTION

Ownership Information
Current Owner: AMERICAN FOREST RESOURCES LLC
% TIMBER RESOURCE SERVICES LLC
Address: 6400 HIGHWAY 66
City, State: Klamath Falls OR
Zipcode: 97601

Assessment Data
Tax District: 32
Open Space: YES
Open Space Date: 1/1/1975
Senior Exemption:
Deeded Acres: 640
Last Revaluation for Tax Year:

Market Value
Land: 24,900
Imp: 0
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 24,900

Taxable Value
Land: 24,900
Imp: 0
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 24,900

Sales History
NO SALES HISTORY RECORDS FOUND!

Building Permits
NO ACTIVE PERMITS!

5 Year Valuation Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Billed Owner</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Impr.</th>
<th>PermCrop Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>AMERICAN FOREST RESOURCES LLC</td>
<td>24,900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24,900</td>
<td>24,900</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,620</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,620</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,620</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>26,440</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26,440</td>
<td></td>
<td>26,440</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>27,270</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27,270</td>
<td></td>
<td>27,270</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td>27,980</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27,980</td>
<td></td>
<td>27,980</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>29,410</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29,410</td>
<td></td>
<td>29,410</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parcel Comments
NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!

Filedate: 8/10/2006 5:11:24 PM

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/t-assessor.asp?pid=687535

8/14/2006
Farm Residence Data Sheet

Parcel Information

Parcel Number: 567535
Map Number: 21-15-34000-0001
Situs:
Legal: ACRES 320.00, CD. 6438; SEC. 34; TWP. 21;
RGE. 15; N 1/2;
Deeded Acres: 320

Ownership Information

Current Owner: AMERICAN FOREST RESOURCES LLC
% TIMBER RESOURCE SERVICES LLC
Address: 6400 HIGHWAY 66
City, State: Klamath Falls OR
Zipcode: 97601

Physical Information

Type:
Quality:
Condition:
Arch Type: error
Style:
Exterior Wall: N/A
Floor Area: 
Basement Area:
Basement Finish: 0
Bedrooms: 
Baths:
Plumbing
Fixtures:
Heat Type:
Roof Type:
Garage Type:
Garage Size:
Year Built/Age: 
Effective Age:
Remodel Date:
Remodel Type:

Agland Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th># Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T5-2</td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5-3</td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6-2</td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6-3</td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Acres: 320

Site Improvement Information
NO SITE IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Perm Crop Information
NO PERM CROP RECORDS FOUND!

Miscellaneous Improvements
NO MISCELLANEOUS IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!
# Property Summary

## Parcel Information
- **Parcel Number:** 567535
- **Map Number:** 21-15-34000-0001
- **Situs:**
- **Legal:** ACRES 320.00, CD. 6438; SEC. 34; TWP. 21; RGE. 15; N 1/2;

## Ownership Information
- **Current Owner:** AMERICAN FOREST RESOURCES LLC
- **Address:** 6400 HIGHWAY 66
- **City, State:** KLAMATH FALLS OR
- **Zipcode:** 97601

## Assessment Data
- **Tax District:** 32
- **Open Space:** YES
- **Open Space Date:** 1/1/1975
- **Exemption:**
- **Deeded Acres:** 320
- **Last Revaluation for Tax Year:**

## Market Value
- **Land:** 17,300
- **Imp:** 0
- **Perm Crop:** 0
- **Total:** 17,300

## Taxable Value
- **Land:** 17,300
- **Imp:** 0
- **Perm Crop:** 0
- **Total:** 17,300

## Sales History
NO SALES HISTORY RECORDS FOUND!

## Building Permits
NO ACTIVE PERMITS!

## 5 Year Valuation Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Billed Owner</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Impr.</th>
<th>Perm Crop Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>AMERICAN FOREST RESOURCES LLC</td>
<td>17,300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17,300</td>
<td>17,300</td>
<td>17,300</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17,800</td>
<td>17,800</td>
<td>17,800</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>18,480</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18,480</td>
<td>18,480</td>
<td>18,480</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,190</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19,190</td>
<td>19,190</td>
<td>19,190</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,680</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19,680</td>
<td>19,680</td>
<td>19,680</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,710</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20,710</td>
<td>20,710</td>
<td>20,710</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Parcel Comments
NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!

Filedate: 8/10/2006 5:11:24 PM

Kittitas County Assessor

205 W 5th Ave Suite 101
Ellensburg, WA 98926
Phone: (509)962-7501
Fax: (509)962-7665

Farm Residence Data Sheet

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 377535
Map Number: 21-15-27000-0001
Situs: 
Legal: ACRES 640.00, CD. 6429; SEC. 27; TWP. 21; RGE. 15; ALL SECTION;
Deeded Acres: 640

Ownership Information
Current Owner: AMERICAN FOREST RESOURCES LLC
% TIMBER RESOURCE SERVICES LLC
Address: 6400 HIGHWAY 66
City, State: KLAMATH FALLS OR
Zipcode: 97601

Physical Information
Type: 
Quality: 
Condition: 
Arch Type: 
Style: error
Exterior Wall: N/A
Floor Area: 
Basement Area: 
Basement: 0
Finish: 
Bedrooms: 

Baths: 
Plumbing 
Fixtures: 
Heat Type: 
Roof Type: 
Garage Type: 
Garage Size: 
Year Built / Age: / 
Effective Age: 
Remodel Date: 
Remodel Type: 

Agland Information
Class
T5-2
T5-3
T6-2
T6-3
T8-1

Type
TIMBER
TIMBER
TIMBER
TIMBER
TIMBER
Use

# Acres
127.8
226
98
171
17.2

Total Acres: 640

Site Improvement Information
NO SITE IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Perm Crop Information
NO PERM CROP RECORDS FOUND!

Miscellaneous Improvements
NO MISCELLANEOUS IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/T-Farm.asp?pid=377535&key=10628

8/14/2006
Property Summary (Appraisal Details)

Parcel Information
- Parcel Number: 377535
- Map Number: 21-15-27000-0001
- Situs: ACRES 840.00, CD. 6429; SEC. 27; TWP. 21; RGE. 15; ALL SECTION;

Ownership Information
- Current Owner: AMERICAN FOREST RESOURCES LLC
- % TIMBER RESOURCE SERVICES LLC
- Address: 6400 HIGHWAY 66
- City, State: Klamath Falls OR
- Zipcode: 97601

Assessment Data
- Tax District: 32
- Open Space: YES
- Date: 1/1/1975
- Senior Exemption:
- Deeded Acres: 640
- Last Revaluation for Tax Year:

Market Value
- Land: 33,270
- Imp: 0
- Perm Crop: 0
- Total: 33,270

Taxable Value
- Land: 33,270
- Imp: 0
- Perm Crop: 0
- Total: 33,270

Sales History
NO SALES HISTORY RECORDS FOUND!

Building Permits
NO ACTIVE PERMITS!

5 Year Valuation Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Billed Owner</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Impr</th>
<th>PermCrop Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>AMERICAN FOREST RESOURCES LLC</td>
<td>33,270</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33,270</td>
<td></td>
<td>33,270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>34,250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>34,250</td>
<td></td>
<td>34,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>35,580</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>35,580</td>
<td></td>
<td>35,580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>36,900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>36,900</td>
<td></td>
<td>36,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td>37,880</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>37,880</td>
<td></td>
<td>37,880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>39,840</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>39,840</td>
<td></td>
<td>39,840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parcel Comments
NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!

Filedate: 8/10/2006 5:11:24 PM
Kittitas County
Assessor

205 W 5th Ave Suite 101
Ellensburg, WA 98926
Phone: (509)962-7501
Fax: (509)962-7666

Farm Residence Data Sheet

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 424935
Map Number: 20-16-15000-0001
Situs:
Legal: ACRES 640.00, CD. 6793; SEC. 15; TWP. 20;
RGE. 16; ALL SECTION
Deeded Acres: 640

Ownership Information
Current Owner: AMERICAN FOREST RESOURCES LLC
% TIMBER RESOURCE SERVICES LLC
Address: 6400 HIGHWAY 66
City, State: Klamath Falls OR
Zipcode: 97601

Physical Information
Type:
Quality:
Condition:
Arch Type:
Style: error
Exterior Wall: N/A
Floor Area:
Basement Area:
Basement: 0
Finish:
Bedrooms:

Baths:
Plumbing
Fixtures:
Heat Type:
Roof Type:
Garage Type:
Garage Size:
Year Built / Age:
Effective Age:
Remodel Date:
Remodel Type:

Agland Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th># Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T5-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Acres: 640

Site Improvement Information
NO SITE IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Perm Crop Information
NO PERM CROP RECORDS FOUND!

Miscellaneous Improvements
NO MISCELLANEOUS IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!
Property Summary

Parcel Information

Parcel Number: 424935
Map Number: 20-16-15000-0001
Situs: 
Legal: ACRES 640.00, CD. 6793; SEC. 15; TWP. 20;
RGE. 16; ALL SECTION

Ownership Information

Current Owner: AMERICAN FOREST RESOURCES LLC
% TIMBER RESOURCE SERVICES LLC
Address: 6400 HIGHWAY 66
City, State: Klamath Falls OR
Zipcode: 97601

Assessment Data

Tax District: 32
Open Space: YES
Open Space Date: 1/1/1975
Senior Exemption: 
Deeded Acres: 640
Last Revaluation for Tax Year:

Market Value

Land: 31,730
Imp: 0
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 31,730

Taxable Value

Land: 31,730
Imp: 0
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 31,730

Sales History
NO SALES HISTORY RECORDS FOUND!

Building Permits
NO ACTIVE PERMITS!

5 Year Valuation Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Billed Owner</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Impr.</th>
<th>PermCrop Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>AMERICAN FOREST RESOURCES LLC</td>
<td>31,730</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31,730</td>
<td>31,730</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>32,650</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>32,650</td>
<td>32,650</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>33,860</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>33,860</td>
<td>33,860</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>35,080</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>35,080</td>
<td>35,080</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>37,840</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>37,840</td>
<td>37,840</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parcel Comments
NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!

Filedate: 8/10/2006 5:11:24 PM

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/t-assessor.asp?pid=424935

8/14/2006
Kittitas County Assessor
205 W 5th Ave Suite 101
Ellensburg, WA 98926
Phone: (509)962-7501
Fax: (509)962-7666

Farm Residence Data Sheet

Parcel Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
<th>814835</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Map Number</td>
<td>20-16-06000-0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>ACRES 510.00, CD. 6755; SEC. 6; TWP. 20; RGE. 16 ALL FRACTIONAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deeded Acres</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ownership Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Owner</th>
<th>AMERICAN FOREST RESOURCES LLC % TIMBER RESOURCE SERVICES LLC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>6400 HIGHWAY 66 Klamath Falls OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zipcode</td>
<td>97601</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Physical Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch Type:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style:</td>
<td>Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Wall:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basement Area:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basement:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finish:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedrooms:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baths:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixtures:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heat Type:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof Type:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage Type:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage Size:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Built / Age:</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Age:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remodel Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remodel Type:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agland Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th># Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T5-2</td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5-3</td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6-2</td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>236</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6-3</td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8-1</td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Acres: 510

Site Improvement Information

NO SITE IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Perm Crop Information

NO PERM CROP RECORDS FOUND!

Miscellaneous Improvements

NO MISCELLANEOUS IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/T-Farm.asp?pid=814835&key=11330

8/14/2006
**Kittitas County Assessor**

205 W 5th Ave Suite 101
Ellensburg, WA 98926
Phone: (509)962-7501
Fax: (509)962-7666

---

**Property Summary** (Appraisal Details)

### Parcel Information

- **Parcel Number**: 814835
- **Map Number**: 20-16-00000-0003
- **Situs**
- **Legal**: ACRES 510.00, CD. 6765; SEC. 6; TWP. 20; RGE. 16 ALL FRACTIONAL

### Ownership Information

- **Current Owner**: AMERICAN FOREST RESOURCES LLC
- **Address**: 6400 HIGHWAY 66
- **City, State**: KLAMATH FALLS OR
- **Zipcode**: 97601

### Assessment Data

- **Tax District**: 44
- **Open Space**: YES
- **Open Space Date**: 1/1/1975
- **Senior Exemption**
- **Deeded Acres**: 510
- **Last Revaluation for Tax Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax District</th>
<th>Land Value</th>
<th>Imp</th>
<th>Perm Crop</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>21,290</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21,290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Market Value

- **Land**: 21,290
- **Imp**: 0
- **Perm Crop**: 0

### Taxable Value

- **Land**: 21,290
- **Imp**: 0
- **Perm Crop**: 0

### Sales History

- **Date**: 10-04-1999
- **Book & Page**: 8895
- **# Parcels**: 32
- **Grantor**: BOISE CASCADE CORPORATION
- **Grantee**: U S TIMBERLANDS YAKIMA LLC
- **Price**: 59,251,295

### Building Permits

NO ACTIVE PERMITS!

### 5 Year Valuation Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Billed Owner</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Impr</th>
<th>PermCrop Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>AMERICAN FOREST RESOURCES LLC</td>
<td>21,290</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21,290</td>
<td>21,290</td>
<td>21,290</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>21,910</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>21,910</td>
<td>21,910</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>22,660</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>22,660</td>
<td>22,660</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>23,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>23,400</td>
<td>23,400</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td>24,020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>24,020</td>
<td>24,020</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,250</td>
<td>25,250</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parcel Comments

NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!

---

NO PERM CROP RECORDS FOUND!

Miscellaneous Improvements
NO MISCELLANEOUS IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Filedate: 8/10/2006 5:11:24 PM
Farm Residence Data Sheet

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 674835
Map Number: 20-16-05000-0009
Situs: ACRES 399.99, CD, 6763; SEC. 5; TWP, 20; RGE. 16; PTN OF SEC PTN NE1/4; N1/2 NW1/4; PTN S1/2 NW1/4; NW1/4 SW1/4 TAX 1; NW1/4 SW1/4 S OF RIVER; S1/2 SW1/4 S OF RIVER; SW1/4 SE1/4 S OF RIVER; E1/2 SE1/4;
Deeded Acres: 399.99

Ownership Information
Current Owner: AMERICAN FOREST RESOURCES LLC % TIMBER RESOURCE SERVICES LLC
Address: 6400 HIGHWAY 66
City, State: KLAMATH FALLS OR
Zipcode: 97601

Physical Information
Type: 
Quality: 
Condition: 
Arch Type: 
Style: error
Exterior Wall: N/A
Floor Area: 
Basement Area: 0
Basement Finish: 
Bedrooms: 

Baths: 
Plumbing: 
Fixtures: 
Heat Type: 
Roof Type: 
Garage Type: 
Garage Size: 
Year Built / Age: / 
Effective Age: 
Remodel Date: 
Remodel Type: 

Agland Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th># Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T5-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>53.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>139.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Acres: 399.99

Site Improvement Information
NO SITE IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Perm Crop Information

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsiferpublic/T-Farm.asp?pid=674835&key=11128 8/14/2006
Parcel Comments
NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!

Filedate: 8/10/2006 5:11:24 PM
Kittitas County Assessor

205 W 5th Ave Suite 101
Ellensburg, WA 98926
Phone: (509)962-7501
Fax: (509)962-7666

Property Summary (Appraisal Details)

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 674835
Map Number: 20-16-05000-0009
Situs:
Legal: ACRES 399.99, CD. 6783; SEC. 5; TWP. 20; RGE. 16; PTN OF SEC PTN NE1/4; N1/2 NW1/4; PTN S1/2 NW1/4; NW1/4 SW1/4 TAX 1; NW1/4 SW1/4 S OF RIVER; S1/2 SW1/4 S OF RIVER; SW1/4 SE1/4 S OF RIVER; E1/2 SE1/4;

Ownership Information
Current Owner: AMERICAN FOREST RESOURCES LLC
% TIMBER RESOURCE SERVICES LLC
Address: 6400 HIGHWAY 66
City, State: KLAMATH FALLS OR
Zipcode: 97601

Assessment Data
Tax District: 32
Open Space: YES
Open Space Date: 1/1/1975
Senior Exemption:
Deeded Acres: 399.99
Last Revaluation for Tax Year:

Market Value
Land: 15,820
Imp: 0
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 15,820

Taxable Value
Land: 15,820
Imp: 0
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 15,820

Sales History
Date: 10-04-1999
Book & Page: 8895
# Parcels: 32
Grantor: BOISE CASCADE CORPORATION
Grantee: U S TIMBERLANDS YAKIMA LLC
Price: 59,251,295

08-01-1997
Book & Page: 4173
# Parcels: 1
Grantee: BOISE CASCADE CORPORATION

Building Permits
NO ACTIVE PERMITS!

5 Year Valuation Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Billed Owner</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Impr.</th>
<th>PermCrop Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>AMERICAN FOREST RESOURCES LLC</td>
<td>15,820</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,820</td>
<td>15,820</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>16,350</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,350</td>
<td>16,350</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,040</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17,040</td>
<td>17,040</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,720</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17,720</td>
<td>17,720</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td>18,250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18,250</td>
<td>18,250</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,180</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19,180</td>
<td>19,180</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsfterpublic/t-assessor.asp?pid=674835

8/14/2006
Farm Residence Data Sheet

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 129234
Map Number: 20-15-0100-0001
Situs: ACRES 569.82, CD. 6164; SEC. 1; TWP. 20; RGE. 15; ALL FRACTIONAL LESS 2.81 FOR CO. ROAD
Deeded Acres: 569.82

Ownership Information
Current Owner: AMERICAN FOREST RESOURCES LLC
% TIMBER RESOURCE SERVICES LLC
Address: 6400 HIGHWAY 66
City, State: KLAMATH FALLS OR
Zipcode: 97601

Physical Information
Type:
Quality:
Condition:
Arch Type:
Style: error
Exterior Wall: N/A
Floor Area:
Basement Area:
Basement: 0
Finish:
Bedrooms:

Baths:
Plumbing:
Fixtures:
Heat Type:
Roof Type:
Garage Type:
Garage Size:
Year Built / Age:
Effective Age:
Remodel Date:
Remodel Type:

Agland Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th># Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T5-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>47.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>223.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Acres: 569.82

Site Improvement Information
NO SITE IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Perm Crop Information
NO PERM CROP RECORDS FOUND!

Miscellaneous Improvements
NO MISCELLANEOUS IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/T-Farm.asp?pid=129234&key=9559
8/14/2006
Parcel Comments
NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!
Kittitas County Assessor

205 W 5th Ave Suite 101
Ellensburg, WA 98926
Phone: (509)962-7501
Fax: (509)962-7666

Property Summary (Appraisal Details)

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 129234
Map Number: 20-15-01000-0001
Situs: ACRE 569.82, CD. 6164; SEC. 1; TWP. 20; RGE. 15; ALL FRACTIONAL LESS 2.91 FOR CO. ROAD
Legal: 32

Ownership Information
Current Owner: AMERICAN FOREST RESOURCES LLC
Address: 6400 HIGHWAY 66
City, State: Klamath Falls OR
Zipcode: 97601

Assessment Data
Tax District: 32
Open Space: YES
Open Space Date: 1/1/1975
Senior Exemption: 
Deeded Acres: 569.82

Market Value
Land: 27,570
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 27,570

Taxable Value
Land: 27,570
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 27,570

Sales History
Date: 10-04-1999  Book & Page: 8895  # Parcels: 32
Grantor: BOISE CASCADE CORPORATION
Grantee: U S TIMBERLANDS YAKIMA LLC
Price: 59,251,295

Date: 04-01-1997  Book & Page: 3477  # Parcels: 1
Grantor: BOISE CASCADE CORPORATION
Grantee: BOISE CASCADE CORPORATION
Price: View Taxes

Date: 04-01-1997  Book & Page: 3476  # Parcels: 1
Grantor: BOISE CASCADE CORPORATION
Grantee: BOISE CASCADE CORPORATION
Price: View Taxes

Building Permits
NO ACTIVE PERMITS!

5 Year Valuation Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Billed Owner</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Impr.</th>
<th>Perm Crop Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>AMERICAN FOREST RESOURCES LLC</td>
<td>27,570</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27,570</td>
<td>27,570</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>28,380</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28,380</td>
<td>28,380</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>29,450</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29,450</td>
<td>29,450</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>30,530</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,530</td>
<td>30,530</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td>31,340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31,340</td>
<td>31,340</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>32,950</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32,950</td>
<td>32,950</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/t-assessor.asp?pid=129234

8/14/2006
Farm Residence Data Sheet

Parcel Information

Parcel Number: 12586
Map Number: 18-18-22030-0010
Situs: REECER CREEK RD ELLENSBURG
Legal: ACRES 54.36, CD. 8653-3; SEC. 22, TWP. 18, RGE. 18; PTN. SW1/4
Deeded Acres: 54.36

Ownership Information

Current Owner: TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC
Address: 1890 NELSON SIDING RD
City, State: CLE ELUM WA
Zipcode: 98922

Physical Information

Type: error
Quality:
Condition:
Arch Type:
Style:
Exterior Wall: N/A
Floor Area:
Basement Area:
Basement: 0
Finish:
Bedrooms:

Baths:
Plumbing
Fixtures:
Heat Type:
Roof Type:
Garage Type:
Garage Size:
Year Built / Age:
Effective Age:
Remodel Date:
Remodel Type:

Agland Information

Class
A7.C2
Type
Use
# Acres
IRRG
54.36

Total Acres: 54.36

Site Improvement Information
NO SITE IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Perm Crop Information
NO PERM CROP RECORDS FOUND!

Miscellaneous Improvements
NO MISCELLANEOUS IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Photos/Sketches

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/T-Farm.asp?pid=12586&key=1369

8/14/2006
Kittitas County Assessor
205 W 5th Ave Suite 101
Ellensburg, WA 98926
Phone: (509)962-7501
Fax: (509)962-7666

Property Summary (Appraisal Details)

Parcel Information

Parcel Number: 12586
Map Number: 18-18-22030-0010
Situs: 4 REECER CREEK RD ELLensburg
Legal: ACRES 54.36, CD. 6653-3; SEC. 22, TWP. 18, RGE. 18; Ptn. SW1/4

Ownership Information

Current Owner: TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC
Address: 1860 NELSON SIDING RD
City, State: CLE ELUM WA
Zipcode: 98922-

Assessment Data

Tax District: 22
Open Space: YES
Open Space Date: 1/1/1978
Senior Exemption:
Deeded Acres: 54.36
Last Revaluation for Tax Year:

Market Value

Land: 173,950
Imp: 900
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 174,850

Taxable Value

Land: 33,000
Imp: 900
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 33,900

Sales History

Date | Book & Page | # Parcels | Grantor | Grantee | Price
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
06-06-2006 | 2006-1368 | 2 | GREENE, MARK L. ETUX | TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC | 5,300,000
12-01-1997 | 4943 | 2 | SPURLING, L. GENE ETUX | GREENE, MARK L. ETUX | 160,000

Building Permits
NO ACTIVE PERMITS!

5 Year Valuation Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Billed Owner</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Impr.</th>
<th>PermCrop Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>GREENE, MARK L. ETUX</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33,900</td>
<td>33,900</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>GREENE, MARK L. ETUX</td>
<td>27,720</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28,620</td>
<td>28,620</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>GREENE, MARK L. ETUX</td>
<td>27,720</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28,620</td>
<td>28,620</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>GREENE, MARK L. ETUX</td>
<td>27,720</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28,620</td>
<td>28,620</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>GREENE, MARK L. ETUX</td>
<td>27,720</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28,620</td>
<td>28,620</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>GREENE, MARK L. ETUX</td>
<td>28,210</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28,110</td>
<td>29,110</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parcel Comments
NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/t-assessor.asp?pid=12586
8/14/2006
Parcel Comments
NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!

Filedate: 8/17/2006 5:00:00 PM
# Property Summary

## Parcel Information
- **Parcel Number:** 12065
- **Map Number:** 20-14-01030-0020
- **Situs:** ACRES 39.92, CD. 5813-3; SEC. 1, TWP. 20, RGE. 14; PTN. SW1/4 (PTN-LOT 2A, B32/P134-137)
- **Legal:** (MUST BE SOLD WITH 20-14-12022-0008)

## Ownership Information
- **Current Owner:** TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC
- **Address:** PO BOX 608
- **City, State:** CLE ELUM WA
- **Zipcode:** 98922

## Assessment Data
- **Tax District:** 31
- **Open Space:** YES
- **Open Space Date:** 1/1/1976
- **Senior Exemption:**
- **Deeded Acres:** 39.92
- **Last Revaluation for Tax Year:**

## Market Value
- **Land:** 2,670
- **Imp:** 0
- **Perm Crop:** 0
- **Total:** 2,670

## Taxable Value
- **Land:** 2,670
- **Imp:** 0
- **Perm Crop:** 0
- **Total:** 2,670

## Sales History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Book &amp; Page</th>
<th># Parcels</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06-20-2006</td>
<td>2006-1501</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>PINE TREE LLC</td>
<td>TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC</td>
<td>479,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-01-2005</td>
<td>2006-1293</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC</td>
<td>PINE TREE LLC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-15-2003</td>
<td>16743</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>PORT QUENDALL DEV CO INC.</td>
<td>TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-27-2000</td>
<td>11798</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>HERBRAND COMPANY THE</td>
<td>PORT QUENDALL DEV CO INC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-26-2000</td>
<td>11791</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>PLUM CREEK LAND CO</td>
<td>HERBRAND COMPANY THE</td>
<td>4,627,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Building Permits
- NO ACTIVE PERMITS!

## 5 Year Valuation Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Billed Owner</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Impr.</th>
<th>Perm Crop Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC</td>
<td>2,670</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,670</td>
<td>2,670</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC</td>
<td>2,870</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,870</td>
<td>2,870</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC</td>
<td>2,890</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,890</td>
<td>2,890</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC</td>
<td>3,070</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,070</td>
<td>3,070</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC</td>
<td>3,240</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,240</td>
<td>3,240</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>View Taxes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsiferpublic/t-assessor.asp?pid=12065

8/18/2006
Farm Residence Data Sheet

Parcel Information

Parcel Number: 12065  
Map Number: 20-14-01030-0020  
Situs:  
Legal: ACRES 39.92, CD, 5813-3; SEC. 1, TWP. 20, RGE. 14; PTN. SW1/4 (PTN-LOT 2A, B32/P134-137) (MUST BE SOLD WITH 20-14-12022-0008)  
Deeded Acres: 39.92

Ownership Information

Current Owner: TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC  
Address: PO BOX 808  
City, State: CLE ELUM WA  
Zipcode: 98922

Physical Information

Type:  
Quality:  
Condition:  
Arch Type:  
Style:  
Exterior Wall: N/A  
Floor Area:  
Basement Area:  
Basement:  
Finish:  
Bedrooms:  

Baths:  
Plumbing:  
Fixtures:  
Heat Type:  
Roof Type:  
Garage Type:  
Garage Size:  
Year Built / Age: /  
Effective Age:  
Remodel Date:  
Remodel Type:  

Agland Information

Class  
T5-3

Type  
TIMBER

Use  

# Acres  
39.92

Site Improvement Information

NO SITE IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Perm Crop Information

NO PERM CROP RECORDS FOUND!

Miscellaneous Improvements

NO MISCELLANEOUS IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/T-Farm.asp?pid=12065&key=9485  
8/18/2006
Kittitas County
Assessor

205 W 5th Ave Suite 101
Ellensburg, WA 98926
Phone: (509)962-7501
Fax: (509)962-7666

Farm Residence Data Sheet

Parcel Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Number: 842534</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Map Number: 20-14-12041-0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situs:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal: ACRES 9.74; CD. 5864-B; SEC. 12; TWP. 20; RGE. 14; NE1/4 SE1/4 TAX #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deeded Acres: 9.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ownership Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Owner: TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address: 1800 NELSON SIDING RD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, State: CLE ELUM WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zipcode: 98922-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Physical Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch Type:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Wall: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basement Area:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basement: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finish:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedrooms:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baths:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixtures:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heat Type:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof Type:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage Type:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage Size:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Built / Age: /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Age:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remodel Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remodel Type:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agland Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th># Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T5-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>TIMBER</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Acres: 9.74

Site Improvement Information

NO SITE IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Perm Crop Information

NO PERM CROP RECORDS FOUND!

Miscellaneous Improvements

NO MISCELLANEOUS IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Kittitas County
Assessor

Property Summary (Appraisal Details)

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 842534
Map Number: 20-14-12041-0001
Situs:
Legal: ACRES 9.74, CD. 5864-B; SEC. 12; TWP. 20;
RGE. 14; NE1/4 SE1/4 TAX #3

Ownership Information
Current Owner: TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC
Address: 1890 NELSON SIDING RD
City, State: CLE ELUM WA
Zipcode: 98922-

Assessment Data
Tax District: 31
Open Space: YES
Open Space Date: 1/1/1975
Senior Exemption:
Deeded Acres: 9.74
Last Revaluation for Tax Year:

Market Value
Land: 510
Imp: 0
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 510

Taxable Value
Land: 510
Imp: 0
Perm Crop: 0
Total: 510

Sales History
Date: 10-29-2004
Book & Page: 2004-2735
# Parcels: 4
Grantor: BOISE CASCADE CORPORATION
Grantee: TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC
Price:

Building Permits
NO ACTIVE PERMITS!

5 Year Valuation Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Billed Owner</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Impr.</th>
<th>PermCrop Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>520</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>540</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>560</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td>580</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parcel Comments
NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/t-assessor.asp?pid=842534

8/18/2006
Farm Residence Data Sheet

 Parcel Information
 Parcel Number: 682534
 Map Number: 20-14-12010-0008
 Situs:
 Legal: ACRES 39.55, CD. 5859; SEC. 12; TWP. 20; RGE. 14; SE1/4 NE1/4 EXC. ABANDONED RR R/W
 Deeded Acres: 39.55

 Ownership Information
 Current Owner: TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC
 Address: 1890 NELSON SIDING RD
 City, State: CLE ELUM WA
 Zipcode: 98922

 Physical Information
 Type: 
 Quality: 
 Condition: 
 Arch Type: 
 Style: error
 Exterior Wall: N/A
 Floor Area: 
 Basement Area: 
 Basement Finish: 0
 Bedrooms: 
 Bath: 
 Plumbing: 
 Fixtures: 
 Heat Type: 
 Roof Type: 
 Garage Type: 
 Garage Size: 
 Year Built / Age: / 
 Effective Age: 
 Remodel Date: 
 Remodel Type: 

 Agland Information
 Type
 Class | Use | # Acres  
-----|-----|--------
 T5-2 | TIMBER | 10.55 
 T5-3 | TIMBER | 20
 T8-1 | TIMBER | 9
 Total Acres: 39.55

 Site Improvement Information
 NO SITE IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

 Perm Crop Information
 NO PERM CROP RECORDS FOUND!

 Miscellaneous Improvements
 NO MISCELLANEOUS IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsiferpublic/T-Farm.asp?pid=682534&key=11147

8/18/2006
# Property Summary

## Parcel Information
- **Parcel Number:** 682534
- **Map Number:** 20-14-12010-0008
- **Situs:**
  - Acres: 39.55, CD. 5859; SEC. 12, TWP. 20; RGE. 14, SE1/4 NE1/4 EXC. ABANDONED RR R/W

## Ownership Information
- **Current Owner:** TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC
- **Address:** 1890 NELSON SIDING RD
- **City, State:** CLE ELUM WA
- **Zipcode:** 98922

## Assessment Data
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax District</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
<th>Open Space Date</th>
<th>Senior Exemption</th>
<th>Deeded Acres</th>
<th>Last Revaluation for Tax Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>1/1/1975</td>
<td></td>
<td>39.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Market Value
- **Land:** 2,070
- **Imp:** 0
- **Perm Crop:** 0
- **Total:** 2,070

## Taxable Value
- **Land:** 2,070
- **Imp:** 0
- **Perm Crop:** 0
- **Total:** 2,070

## Sales History
- **Date:** 10-29-2004
- **Book & Page:** 2004-2735
- **# Parcels:** 4
- **Grantor:** BOISE CASCADE CORPORATION
- **Grantee:** TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC
- **Price:**

## Building Permits
- **NO ACTIVE PERMITS!**

## 5 Year Valuation Information
- **Year:**
  - 2006 TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC
  - 2005
  - 2004
  - 2003
  - 2002
  - 2001
- **Billed Owner:**
  - 2,070
  - 2,130
  - 2,220
  - 2,310
  - 2,370
  - 2,500
- **Land:**
  - 2,070
  - 2,130
  - 2,220
  - 2,310
  - 2,370
  - 2,500
- **Impr.:**
  - 0
  - 0
  - 0
  - 0
  - 0
  - 0
- **Perm Crop Value:**
  - 0
  - 0
  - 0
  - 0
  - 0
  - 0
- **Total:**
  - 2,070
  - 2,130
  - 2,220
  - 2,310
  - 2,370
  - 2,500
- **Exempt:**
  - 0
  - 0
  - 0
  - 0
  - 0
  - 0
- **Taxable:**
  - 2,070
  - 2,130
  - 2,220
  - 2,310
  - 2,370
  - 2,500

## Parcel Comments
- **NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!**
Farm Residence Data Sheet

Parcel Information
Parcel Number: 572534
Map Number: 20-14-12010-0001
Situs:
Legal: ACRES 40.00, CD. 5854; SEC. 12; TWP. 20; RGE. 14; NE1/4 NE1/4
Deeded Acres: 40

Ownership Information
Current Owner: TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC
Address: 1890 NELSON SIDING RD
City, State: CLE ELUM WA
Zipcode: 98922

Physical Information
Type: 
Quality: 
Condition: 
Arch Type: 
Style: error
Exterior Wall: N/A
Floor Area: 
Basement Area: 
Basement Finish: 0
Bedrooms: 
Baths: 
Plumbing: 
Fixtures: 
Heat Type: 
Roof Type: 
Garage Type: 
Garage Size: 
Year Built / Age: /
Effective Age: 
Remodel Date: 
Remodel Type: 

Agland Information
Class
T5-3
T8-1

Type
Use
TIMBER
TIMBER

# Acres
38
2
Total Acres: 40

Site Improvement Information
NO SITE IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

Perm Crop Information
NO PERM CROP RECORDS FOUND!

Miscellaneous Improvements
NO MISCELLANEOUS IMPROVEMENT RECORDS FOUND!

**Property Summary (Appraisal Details)**

**Parcel Information**
- **Parcel Number:** 572534
- **Map Number:** 20-14-12010-0001
- **Situs:**
- **Legal:** ACRES 40.00, CO. 5854; SEC. 12; TWP. 20; RGE. 14; NE1/4 NE1/4

**Ownership Information**
- **Current Owner:** TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC
- **Address:** 1890 NELSON SIDING RD
- **City, State:** CLE ELUM WA
- **Zipcode:** 98922

**Assessment Data**
- **Tax District:** 31
- **Open Space:** YES
- **Open Space Date:** 1/1/1975
- **Deeded Acres:** 40
- **Last Revaluation for Tax Year:**

**Market Value**
- **Land:** 2,550
- **Imp:** 0
- **Perm Crop:** 0
- **Total:** 2,550

**Taxable Value**
- **Land:** 2,550
- **Imp:** 0
- **Perm Crop:** 0
- **Total:** 2,550

**Sales History**
- **Date:** 10-29-2004
- **Book & Page:** 2004-2735
- **# Parcels:** 4
- **Grantor:** BOISE CASCADE CORPORATION
- **Grantee:** TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC

**Building Permits**
- NO ACTIVE PERMITS!

**5 Year Valuation Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Billed Owner</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Impr.</th>
<th>PermCrop Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>TEANAWAY RIDGE LLC</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,620</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,620</td>
<td>2,620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,740</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,740</td>
<td>2,740</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,850</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,850</td>
<td>2,850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,850</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,850</td>
<td>2,850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,930</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,930</td>
<td>2,930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,080</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,080</td>
<td>3,080</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parcel Comments**
- NO PARCEL COMMENTS FOR THIS RECORD!

http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/taxsifterpublic/t-assessor.asp?pid=572534

8/18/2006