

Jackson Purcell
PO Box 663
Easton, WA 98925
Email: jackson0121@gmail.com

Bradley Gasawski
Planner 1
Kittitas County Community Development Services
411 N Ruby Street Suite 2
Ellensburg, WA 98926
Bradley.gasawski@co.kittitas.wa.us

RE: Majestic Group SEPA Application SE-24-0020

Parcel #778834

I want to voice my concerns with the application to clear the land on parcel #778834. This parcel has been attempted to develop for several years by several applicants and has been abandoned for a variety of reasons. I don't believe the county should allow a parcel of land to be cleared of all the vegetation before a plan or proposal has been created. This has the chance of affecting our community in many negative ways for the potential profits of an absentee owner. I believe this process to allow this SEPA application to move forward without the current applicant, Majestic Group LLC, having a plan or proposal with the land is a flawed process and destructive to the community.

After reading the SEPA checklist that the applicant turned into the county, I see many discrepancies and flaws in the application. They have not been researched or little time has been added to their answers. I will outline some of them below.

A. Background

7. Do you have any plans for future. additions. expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes explain.

“Not at this me” is not an accurate answer. The applicant explains in the answer to question 11 “the proposal may include a Short Plat”.

A short plat would be considered further activity and if not completely addressed on this SEPA an additional SEPA will be required. As stated above, doesn't make sense to allow the development of a parcel without a future plan.

8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared or will be prepared directly related to this proposal.

“A Drainage Report has previously completed”

There is no attachment of such drainage report or when it might have been conducted.

B. Environmental Elements

1. Earth

c. What general types of soils are found on the site.

“The site is comprised entirely of kladnick, ashy, sandy loam. The soil belongs to Hydrologic Soil Group

A, meaning it is well drained and has a high infiltration rate”

This creates the concern for infiltration of any contaminants from this land to run into Lake Easton and the Yakima River as this property sits above both bodies of water.

5. Animals

a. List any birds or other animals that have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site.

“None observed at this time, but the site is in an area that provides habitat for many woodland species.

This is an example of absentee owners and little effort to understand the site. The previous two applications to develop this land had Department of Fish and Wildlife comment on how it will affect the local wildlife. There are dozens of species of wildlife on or near the parcel to were not mentioned. Easton is a rural community and the wildlife and preservation of such is a quality I want to keep.

7. Environmental Health

b. Noise

3. Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts if any:

“A 20’ wide buffer of trees and vegetation around the entire perimeter of the parcel will remain untouched to provide a buffer which will help dampen the construction noise.

This statement conflicts with the answer to 4. Plants b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered? “Trees and brush will be removed from the majority of the parcel excluding a 50’ perimeter buffer. This conflicting information which is also repeated on the answer to 10. Aesthetics c. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts if any: A 20’ buffer of trees and vegetation will be maintained around the entire perimeter of the parcel to reduce and control aesthetic impacts. There needs to be clarification on what the true buffer is intended to be and the effectiveness of its determination.

13. Historical and cultural preservation

c. Describe the methods used to assess the potential impacts to cultural and historic resources on or near the project site

“No cultural or historical impacts”

Several state agencies and tribes have stated in the past two applications to develop this land that they were concerned or interested in possible historical and cultural impacts. This again shows that lack of research and care from the current applicant.

14. Transportation

a. Identify public Streets and highways serving the site or affected geographic area and describe the proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans if any.

“Access will be off of Sparks Road at the current “T” intersection north of Exit 70.”

The proposed T intersection has a 130’ right of way and limited access boundary on each side of the T. I believe adding another entrance/exit to the intersection without even knowing the future of this proposal is again putting the cart before the horse. This intersection needs to be studied more, the applicant is still trying to use 2019 traffic data which is flawed as by the newer traffic study done this year purchased by myself and others in the community.

In conclusion, I don’t believe this application and the county’s process of allowing land to be cleared and roads to be created without a future proposal is not only harmful for the community, but it will set a bad precedent for the future of Kittitas County and the CDS department. Once this land is cleared, there is no going back. There is a reason why so many developers have abandoned proposals on development of this property. We are tired of continuing to be the only ones to know anything about this property. I am not against development but the lack of care and attention to details has caused the community to spend lots of time and money on such. It is a waste of CDS’s time as well and could be mitigated with better organization of historical data.