




# KITITITAS COUNTY

## DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

---

### MEMORANDUM

---

TO: All Staff  
FROM: Justin Turnbull, County Surveyor   
DATE: May 20, 2021  
SUBJECT: County 2<sup>nd</sup> Survey Review of Final Cluster Plat LPF-20-00005 (Forest Ridge Ph1)

#### Of Note

Typically a second review only addresses prior comments and checks that the required changes have been met. Due to the significant amount of change including revision and removal of lots a complete re-review was performed.

#### Required Elements that Need to be Discussed or Addressed

1. The outer plat boundaries and section lines deviate from the record document referred to in the legal description (SUR:31-224). While it is possible that the record document contains errors, there are some particular areas of concern in the submitted Plat:
  - a. The West line of Section 24 was evenly divided per SUR:31-224. Dimensions shown on the plat are not an even division. It is possible that the surveyor held found corners, but this is not identified as the reasoning behind the discrepancy.
  - b. The East boundary line of Section 24 is recorded as being a straight line from NE corner to SE corner. The East quarter corner was not recovered during the course of this survey. The surveyor has elected to put an angle point in the section line at the NE corner of the SE 1/4 SE 1/4. The existing found evidence was called out as being off. What is the justification for angling the section line at this point, particularly in the absence of suitable corner evidence?
  - c. The corner mentioned in change 1b. listed above is called out as being 1.2 feet off. With the section corner calls varying from record by as much as 0.44 feet, it is uncertain as to what evidence was held as control to determine the bearing and distance to the found corner at this location.
  - d. The south line of the original division as shown upon SUR:31-224 had an angle point at the N-S centerline of section. The application shows no angle point, and the resulting line falls about 1.4 feet north of calculated position. What is the justification for the change in the line? Was there found evidence that is not mentioned?
  - e. The SW corner of SUR:31-224 has also been revised from record to show an angle point in the section line, based upon found evidence. What is the justification in holding this evidence and changing the lines of record vs. calling the found corner as 0.14' off?

#### Required Changes

2. All the easements DW-1 through DW-5 and UT-1 through UT-2 incorrectly reference sheet 6 rather than Sheet 7.
3. The dimension of 421.23 at the south end of AC-1 should show 'crows feet' to identify what the dimension is measuring.
4. There are still multiple occurrences of crossing linework obscuring text.

5. The following Line/curve labels do not appear on a line or curve table:  
C2, C7, C14, L3, L4, and L5
6. C4 appears in 2 locations, the Northernmost one being incorrect and located near the N'most corner of lot 33. It should be removed.
7. The division between DW-4 and DW-5 should be identified.
8. The N'most curve in Lot 34 does not match the closure report. This particular curve is also mismatched between the closure report values for Lot 34 and OS-2.
9. The N'most curve on the East line of AC-1 does not match the closure report.
10. As the Legal description identifies all the area as shown within the bold boundary on Sheet 3, the remainder area should be identified as a Lot or Tract, and area shown.
11. While it is Public Works opinion that Open Space Lots do not need to have corners staked, under the current configuration, it gives the appearance that Tract OS-1 is bounded by the outer plat boundary which WOULD need corners set. If comment #10 above is addressed, then Tract OS-1 clearly falls inside the plat boundaries and corners would not be required.