

November 2, 2022

Kittitas Community Development Services  
411 N Ruby St, Suite 2  
Ellensburg, WA 98926

Re: Long Plat 22-00005 "Suncadia Phase 2 Division 8"

Before the CDS Staff recommend to the commissioners to approve this latest development from "Suncadia Resort LLC" please consider and fully address these issues:

1. The developer continues to thumb their nose at the rules and protocols established and agreed to in the "December 2008 Amended and Restated Development Agreement Exhibit F-1" as I have indicated in the past. Specifically, they are in violation of Sections B-43 and B-44 both of which impact air quality. They have also failed to comply with C-29. At no time since moving here full time in 2019 have any of these three conditions been met by the developer. A plan needs to be implemented to monitor the developer and establish corrective measures for non-compliance.
2. The developer's response to SEPA Environmental Checklist item 14.h does not say they will comply, it merely directs you, the CDS staff to "please refer to the MPR Conditions of Approval, sections C-1 through C-20B". Note - this is the exact document I refer to above, technically known as Exhibit F-1 to The Agreement, which they have continually violated. While referring to this specific section of Exhibit F-1 to imply compliance, they have actually highlighted their LACK of compliance with item C-17, Traffic Monitoring Program. When will CDS and/or Public Works demand completion of the stipulated Traffic Monitoring Program?
3. SEPA Checklist Attachment 13.b indicates the developer will remove the historic water line (KT02147) which is part of the Roslyn Water system without any regard to its possible historic significance. According to the February 24, 2022 letter from the Washington Department of Archaeology & Historic Preservation to Kelly Bacon, Planner 1, KCCDS, "It should be determined whether the segment of the Roslyn Waterline Complex (KT02147) that passes

through the proposed project area is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. If this site is determined eligible, a permit from DAHP will be required in order to work within its boundary.” While the letter was in reference to a previous development in Suncadia, the same historic water line traverses this development. Has CDS and/or the property owner (Suncadia) determined the historic significance of this water line per the letter? Would it not be prudent to investigate this before it is permanently destroyed?

Ira Astrachan  
351 Big Rock Lane  
Cle Elum, WA 98922