

**From:** [ECY RE CRO SEPA Coordinator](#)  
**To:** [Chace Pedersen](#); [Jeremiah Cromie](#); [Kelly Bacon \(CD\)](#)  
**Cc:** [babbijean@gmail.com](mailto:babbijean@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** FW: Ellensburg Meat Processing Facility  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 7, 2023 9:58:08 AM  
**Attachments:** [opposition.docx](#)

---

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside the Kittitas County network. Do not click links, open attachments, fulfill requests, or follow guidance unless you recognize the sender and have verified the content is safe.

Hello all,

Please see the attached comment letter from Babette Mundy.

Babette Mundy, just wanted to inform you that it is the Lead Agency's responsibility to consider timely comments on the notice of application [SEPA 202300679](#).

### **WAC 197-11-355**

Optional DNS process.

(1) If a GMA county/city with an integrated project review process (RCW 36.70B.060) is lead agency for a proposal and has a reasonable basis for determining significant adverse environmental impacts are unlikely, it may use a single integrated comment period to obtain comments on the notice of application and the likely threshold determination for the proposal. If this process is used, a second comment period will typically not be required when the DNS is issued (refer to subsection (4) of this section).

(2) If the lead agency uses the optional process specified in subsection (1) of this section, the lead agency shall:

(a) State on the first page of the notice of application that it expects to issue a DNS for the proposal, and that:

(i) The optional DNS process is being used;

(ii) This may be the only opportunity to comment on the environmental impacts of the proposal;

(iii) The proposal may include mitigation measures under applicable codes, and the project review process may incorporate or require mitigation measures regardless of whether an EIS is prepared; and

(iv) A copy of the subsequent threshold determination for the specific proposal may be obtained upon request (in addition, the lead agency may choose to maintain a general mailing list for threshold determination distribution).

(b) List in the notice of application the conditions being considered to mitigate environmental impacts, if a mitigated DNS is expected;

(c) Comply with the requirements for a notice of application and public notice in RCW 36.70B.110; and

(d) Send the notice of application and environmental checklist to:

- (i) Agencies with jurisdiction, the department of ecology, affected tribes, and each local agency or political subdivision whose public services would be changed as a result of implementation of the proposal; and
  - (ii) Anyone requesting a copy of the environmental checklist for the specific proposal (in addition, the lead agency may choose to maintain a general mailing list for checklist distribution).
- (3) If the lead agency indicates on the notice of application that a DNS is likely, an agency with jurisdiction may assume lead agency status during the comment period on the notice of application (WAC 197-11-948).

**(4) The responsible official shall consider timely comments on the notice of application and either:**

- (a) Issue a DNS or mitigated DNS with no comment period using the procedures in subsection (5) of this section;
  - (b) Issue a DNS or mitigated DNS with a comment period using the procedures in subsection (5) of this section, if the lead agency determines a comment period is necessary;
  - (c) Issue a DS; or
  - (d) Require additional information or studies prior to making a threshold determination.
- (5) If a DNS or mitigated DNS is issued under subsection (4)(a) of this section, the lead agency shall send a copy of the DNS or mitigated DNS to the department of ecology, agencies with jurisdiction, those who commented, and anyone requesting a copy. A copy of the environmental checklist need not be recirculated.

Cheers,

Lucila Cornejo  
WA State Dept. of Ecology  
Central Regional ERTS & SEPA Coordinator  
1250 W, Alder Street  
Union Gap, WA 98903-0009  
(509) 208-4590

---

**From:** Tasaka, Emily (ECY) <etas461@ECY.WA.GOV>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 6, 2023 11:18 AM  
**To:** Cornejo, Lucila (ECY) <luco461@ECY.WA.GOV>  
**Subject:** FW: Ellensburg Meat Processing Facility

Hi Lucy, are you the right person to forward this to?

---

**From:** Babette Mundy <[babbijean@gmail.com](mailto:babbijean@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 6, 2023 8:31 AM  
**To:** Tasaka, Emily (ECY) <[etas461@ECY.WA.GOV](mailto:etas461@ECY.WA.GOV)>; Park, Sage (ECY) <[SUEB461@ECY.WA.GOV](mailto:SUEB461@ECY.WA.GOV)>; Team Yakima (DFW) <[teamyakima@dfw.wa.gov](mailto:teamyakima@dfw.wa.gov)>  
**Subject:** Ellensburg Meat Processing Facility

Good Morning,

Please review and consider the attached letter. Many others are opposed to this and the answers to the issues in the attached letter need adequate response.

Thank You,

Babette Mundy

I am writing to express concerns regarding the proposed meat processing facility by 3 BR Custom Cuts located at 3200 Wilson Creek Rd in Ellensburg, Wa.

My home directly borders this property on the south at 3100 Wilson Creek Rd. This project will have a highly negative affect on the quality of life for my family, our neighbors, the surrounding areas, and the environment. Our concerns are:

Firstly the name referenced on the SEPA application and the permit are not the same. What project is being referenced?

The scope of this project is extremely vague and there is a huge amount of room for changes to be made once this facility is started without any oversight. There is an extreme lack of transparency surrounding this proposal. Some questions that need to be answered are:

- How many cattle will be processed daily? Weekly?
- Will there be animals in holding pens overnight? Over the weekend?
- How often will the rendering trucks pick up waste and *where will that waste be stored* between rendering truck pickups?
- Are there plans to process other animals such as pigs?
- What are the future plans for this facility such as subscription services?

Ground water and storm water runoff:

- Will be negatively affected by the debris from holding pens and from the water used to wash down facilities.
- The septic system proposed for this facility is not adequate to deal with the waste from animal slaughter.
- There is an irrigation ditch along Wilson Creek that will be impacted by this runoff and carried downstream to other users of this water.
- The impact of groundwater contamination into neighboring wells *must* be assessed. These issues must be considered a serious public health and safety issue.
- The storm water runoff consequences of adding additional hard surfaces such as concrete foundations and driveways also must be addressed.

Air quality

- Noise and dust from multiple cattle being held in holding pens for an unspecified amount of time and large vehicle traffic will absolutely have an effect on air quality and pollution.
- Unmitigated odor has to be considered as again this is a very vague plan that does not address how long cattle will be held in holding pens, how often will the rendering truck carry away waste and *where will that waste be contained* between trips from the rendering truck?
- Dust, odor, and air quality will be an issue for all residents in this Rural Residential neighborhood.
- Glare from large security lighting 24/7 will be a disturbance to those living in this Rural Residential neighborhood.

## Traffic

- Is a huge consideration as well. The effects of large trucks hauling cattle, rendering trucks coming and going, employees, and individuals dropping off livestock will damage roadways.
- Creates a hazard for local residents, their children and pets.
- A Traffic Impact Analysis is required.

## Property values

- Will be adversely affected. Studies show that property values are considerably less surrounding meat processing facilities. This facility would make it impossible to sell a neighboring home at fair market value for all of the surrounding area.

A Conditional Use permit for zoning should only be considered if the following criteria are met (KCC 17.60A.015)

A. The proposed use is essential or desirable to the public convenience and not detrimental or injurious to the public health, peace, or safety or to the character of the surrounding neighborhood.

B. The proposed use at the proposed location will not be unreasonably detrimental to the economic welfare of the county and that it will not create excessive public cost for facilities and services by finding that:

- i. It will be adequately serviced by existing facilities such as highways, roads, police and fire protection, irrigation and drainage structures, refuse disposal, water and sewers, and schools; or
- ii. The applicant shall provide such facilities; or
- iii. The proposed use will be of sufficient economic benefit to offset additional public costs or economic detriment.

C. The proposed use complies with relevant development standards and criteria for approval set forth in this title or other applicable provisions of Kittitas County Code.

D. The proposed use will mitigate material impacts of the development, whether environmental or otherwise.

E. The proposed use will ensure compatibility with existing neighboring land uses.

F. The proposed use is consistent with the intent and character of the zoning district in which it is located.

G. For conditional uses outside of Urban Growth Areas, the proposed use:

- i. Is consistent with the intent, goals, policies, and objectives of the Kittitas County Comprehensive Plan, including the policies of Chapter 8, Rural and Resource Lands;
- ii. Preserves "rural character" as defined in the Growth Management Act (RCW 36.70A.030(16\*\*));
- iii. Requires only rural government services; and
- iv. Does not compromise the long term viability of designated resource lands.

In particular of these criteria to consider is:

- A-This facility is *not* essential or desirable and *is* detrimental and injurious to health, peace, safety, and character of the surrounding neighborhood. There are many in the surrounding area who are deeply concerned and opposed to this facility.

- D- In fact on the SEPA report many of the environmental issues are not addressed at all or in a very cursory manner.
- E- Extremely **non** compatible.
- F- Again not consistent with either the intent or character of this zoning district which is **Rural Residential**.

The SEPA report that is posted regarding this proposed facility is sadly lacking in accurate information and does not detail any specifics to the question above. Environmental impact studies are required to determine the answers to these questions.

While a facility such as this, on a reasonable scale, might benefit Kittitas County, at this location it is completely inappropriate. This is a rural *neighborhood* two miles outside of town and not a large unpopulated acreage. The site itself is not conducive to such an operation as it is an extremely narrow lot. Of utmost concern is the lack of oversight once this is in place. There are no restrictions or guidelines that must be followed. The *county must demand transparency* from the applicant regarding their future plans for this facility.

This will only have a negative influence on our local community and take away not only our investments, but our quality of life and right to enjoy our own properties.

Kittitas County would be doing a severe disservice to its tax paying citizens if it allows this to move forward.

Thank You,

Babette Mundy

3100 Wilson Creek Rd

(509) 856-6238

babbijean@gmail.com