

No.	ELEMENT ADDRESSED IN COUNTY'S MAY 20, 2011 LETTER	<i>Summary of Impacts (From County 5/20/11 letter)</i>	Summary of Possible Mitigation	Applicant Response (Alternative Mitigation)	<i>County Initial Response¹</i>
1	Earth	<i>Earth - The proposed development includes areas of geological hazard that pose a threat to life and property. Portions of the site are subject to alluvial fan hazards that may result in sudden and destructive movements of water and water-bourn debris that is likely to result in loss of property and life in areas subject to this hazard. Portions of the site are subject to large magnitude water and debris flows across flatter portions of the site resulting from flows from steeper portions of the site as shown by large capacity dry channels that cross the westerly portion of the site. The easterly portion of the site is subject to rock-fall both in areas of existing talus slopes and from disturbance of the site from road, infrastructure and residential construction. These existing conditions along with the proposed development present the potential for significant adverse environmental impacts.</i>	no development in alluvial fans or outflow areas; open space area for around alluvial fan areas; analysis of potential off-site flow downstream; address rockfall hazards	<p>The 2016 proposed development addresses areas within the alluvial fan locations with limited development and distance. (see Exh. SEPA#1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The alluvial fan area in the north west corner of the property will be private property with restrictions for the removal foliage or land clearing. - The alluvial fan located in the southern portion of the property and east of the BPA transmission corridor will be addressed in a similar fashion with restrictions on de-foliating and land clearing. Distance will also be provided with lands to the west of the BPA easement being dedicated to campground and RV Park uses. - Current area of the active rock quarry, operating under DNR Surface Mining Permit #70-013176 will be phased out of operations. This location will be reclaimed and re-purposed into the 100,000 gallon water storage tank facility required under Water District Resolution #03096.2. Geological assessments and structural oversight will be in place as this portion of the development commences. - The limited development proposed for those areas east of the BPA easement corridor will be assessed as development is determined for these locations. Proposed development in these locations will be limited to 10 SFR in the NW corner of the parcel and 4 large lot parcels covering the eastern 2/3rd of the parcel. . - Rock fall hazards and the potential for impacts from the steeper eastern slopes of the parcel should have little or no impacts in the completed 2016 development proposal. During construction periods to access the bench area, normal construction standards will be in place with geological and structural engineering oversight of the road and utility extension. Once construction activity is completed, exposure 	

¹ Modified potential conditions from County 5/20/11 letter, in response to the Applicant Alternative Mitigation and Multifamily Option Concept Plan submitted by Applicant with March 2014 with Development Agreement application. Subject to revision following resubmittal of required SEPA Addendum information and revisions to applications for PUD, Preliminary Plat and Development Agreement.

No.	ELEMENT ADDRESSED IN COUNTY'S MAY 20, 2011 LETTER	<i>Summary of Impacts (From County 5/20/11 letter)</i>	Summary of Possible Mitigation	Applicant Response (<i>Alternative Mitigation</i>)	<i>County Initial Response¹</i>
				will be limited by distance from possible hazards. For the limited future development possibilities mentioned, assessments and studies will be factored at the time of permit applications. (See Geo-tech Exhibit)	
2	Air	<i>Air - FEIS did not identify significant air quality impacts.</i>	compliance with applicable laws and standards	Current quarry work will impact air quality but is addressed within the mining permit. Decommissioning of the quarry will reduce impacts as residential construction commences.	<i>No mitigation is recommended beyond compliance with applicable laws and standards (e.g., requirement to prepare a Fugitive Dust Control Plan).</i>
3	Water	<i>Surface water - The FEIS did not identify significant surface water impacts.</i>	surface water - implement stormwater manual of Eastern WA; ground water - Easton water district needs to obtain more water rights or applicant needs to obtain and transfer to Easton water district	SURFACE WATER - Applicant will abide by stormwater regulations.	
		<i>Ground water - Water supply is a potentially significant issue for this development. Domestic water supply from the Easton Water District is not adequate to serve the development, given existing water rights and commitments to development within the district.</i> <i>The district has applied for additional water rights in the amount of 112 ac-ft. The application has been pending since 1990. There is no assurance that this water right will be granted by the State of Washington in the near future. If granted, this water right likely would provide sufficient water to serve the development at rural densities of one unit per three acres.</i> <i>These existing conditions along with the proposed development present the potential</i>		GROUND WATER – The proposed development includes negotiated agreements in place with Kittias County Water District #3 under Resolution #030796-2 providing for service levels to accommodate the proposed development and substantial mitigations completed and further mitigation outlined under a pre-determined phasing schedule. (see Water Exh.)	

No.	ELEMENT ADDRESSED IN COUNTY'S MAY 20, 2011 LETTER	<i>Summary of Impacts (From County 5/20/11 letter)</i>	Summary of Possible Mitigation	Applicant Response (Alternative Mitigation)	County Initial Response ¹
		<i>for significant adverse environmental impacts.</i>			
4	Plants	<i>Plants - The proposed development may affect limited wetland areas on the eastern portion of the site. Several wetland areas were identified through reconnaissance level field work on the eastern portion of the site. No wetland delineations were prepared. Impacts on wetlands may be mitigated by identification and avoidance by locating roads, infrastructure and lot layout to avoid wetlands and buffer areas. If impacts on buffers or wetlands are not avoidable, mitigation can be implemented. Without mitigation there is a potential for significant adverse impacts to wetlands.</i>	wetlands survey and delineation required prior to subdivision or other development within site preserve existing wetlands and buffers	Agree. The FEIS and work by Radeake Associates has already identified these areas of concern. The majority of current proposed development will not be located in or impact this region of the parcel. As minor residential development process into the area, assessments and mitigations will be conducted specific to proposed work. (see Raedeke Exh.)	
5	Animals	<i>Animals - The proposed development, in conjunction with other approved development by the applicant in the immediate vicinity is likely to have significant adverse impacts to wildlife. Approval of a PUD with the number, size and arrangement of units proposed on the site with three times the underlying rural density would:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Displace wildlife habitat over a substantial portion of the site and result in proximity impacts to wildlife outside of developed portions of the site. - Severely curtail the movement of wildlife on a currently very productive wildlife corridor that extends along the north side of the Yakima River and currently has a 	wildlife movement easement must be reviewed by WDFW, includes areas owned by applicant but not within the PUD boundary (west side of BPA line easement and area of 40% slope on eastern portions); wildlife management plan must be completed and reviewed by WDFW; wildlife management plan shall include recreation use that doesn't restrict wildlife movement; lots along BPA ROW should be 300'X300'; no development in or near the PUD during operation of the rock quarry	The majority of the recommended wildlife easement in the BPA ROW is delineated within the PUD boundary as open space. The existing 150-foot wide BPA ROW corridor remains available for elk use in the fall and early winter. Wildlife movement is increasingly focused on WDOT's new wildlife bridge area(s) being evaluated further west off I-90 at Easton Hill. The wildlife corridor(s) indicated in the FEIS Fig. 3-42, is included within the applicant's forest stewardship plan area. In lieu of restricting residential development during quarry operations, the applicant proposes that PUD construction occur in phases and plat notes are used to notify the public of surface mine areas.	i) <i>In order to provide for continued wildlife movement on established productive corridors, no approval of a subdivision final plat or other development within the PUD site may proceed until an easement for wildlife movement is filed which shall:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Include the area from the west side of the BPA transmission line easement to the area of 40 percent slopes on the eastern portion of the site. This condition includes areas owned by the applicant not currently included in the PUD boundary, however, encumbrance of this property is necessary to mitigate impacts of the proposal. - A wildlife management plan shall be completed in conjunction with the

No.	ELEMENT ADDRESSED IN COUNTY'S MAY 20, 2011 LETTER	<i>Summary of Impacts (From County 5/20/11 letter)</i>	Summary of Possible Mitigation	Applicant Response (Alternative Mitigation)	County Initial Response ¹
		<p><i>very low level of human disturbance.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Severely curtail the movement of wildlife on the moderately sloping bench area of the eastern portion of the site.</i> <p><i>The applicant has indicated the desire to pursue approval of a quarry operation in bedrock areas of the site east of the BPA transmission line. Cumulative impacts of such a development on wildlife movement have not been assessed; however it is reasonable to conclude that the combined result of such a use with residential use on the opposite side of the corridor would adversely effect wildlife movement. These existing conditions along with the proposed development present the potential for significant adverse environmental impacts.</i></p>			<p><i>easement, both of which shall be reviewed by the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>The wildlife management plan shall provide for recreation use of the corridor which such restrictions in type of facilities and time of use consistent with the primary use as a wildlife corridor.</i> i) <i>In order to provide for continued wildlife movement on established productive corridors, lots bordering the BPA easement shall be a minimum of 300 feet in width and 300 feet in depth. A 150-foot wide easement for preservation of native vegetation shall be provided adjacent to the BPA transmission line. Forest practices within the buffer areas shall be limited to the 100 feet furthest from the wildlife corridor and limited to selected removal that may not include removal of more than 20 percent of stems or 30 percent of board feet, whichever is less, over any 5 year period. All tree removal shall be evenly distributed over the managed portion of the buffer. Undergrowth and lower limbs of trees shall be maintained to limit visibility through the buffer.</i> ii) <i>In order to provide for continued wildlife movement on established productive corridors, no subdivision or other development within the PUD boundary may proceed during the process of applications for and operation of a quarry on any portion of the PUD or adjacent to the PUD. This condition limits only development of the PUD and does not affect the approval process for a</i>

No.	ELEMENT ADDRESSED IN COUNTY'S MAY 20, 2011 LETTER	<i>Summary of Impacts (From County 5/20/11 letter)</i>	Summary of Possible Mitigation	Applicant Response (Alternative Mitigation)	County Initial Response ¹
					<i>quarry and does not provide a presumption that a proposal for a quarry may be approved or denied.</i>
6	Energy & Natural Resources	<i>Energy & Natural Resources - FEIS did not identify significant energy and natural resources impacts.</i>	compliance with applicable laws and standards	No mitigations	<i>No mitigation is recommended beyond compliance with applicable laws and standards.</i>
7	Environmental Health	<i>Environmental Health - FEIS did not identify significant impacts associated with environmental health, including noise or hazardous materials.</i>	compliance with applicable laws and standards	AIRPORT- New residents will be impacted by noise from the Easton Airport; notice will be of title regarding the presences of and associated issues in living close to an airport per the Washington State WSDOT Airport and Compatible Land Use program Guidebook. (See Airport Exhibit)	<i>No mitigation is recommended beyond compliance with applicable laws and standards; (may need to analyze noise if continue quarry.)</i>
8	Land & Shoreline	<i>Land & Shoreline Use - The proposed development is likely to have significant adverse impacts to land use and rural character. Development of the site at the proposed density of three times the underlying Rural Zoning density of one 1 unit per three acres, as allowable with PUD approval, will result in a number, size and arrangement of units on the site that will not meet criteria for rural development, according to the Comprehensive Plan. A minimum lot size of approximately 1.5 acres in size is generally consistent with rural character in a clustered development, provided that larger lot sizes are appropriate on the perimeter of the site to assure compatibility with existing large lot rural development and larger lots are appropriate adjacent to wildlife corridors. A buffer adjacent to adjacent natural resource land in permanent forestry use is beneficial in</i>	1 unit per 3 acres is limit on density for project to maintain the characteristics of rural community; lot layout should be in general conformance to Alternative 4 layout in FEIS; minimum lot size should be 1.5 acres; minimum lot size on west and south sides shall be 2 acres with minimum width of 250 feet; 200 foot buffer on north side from productive forest lands; open space devoted to long term forestry on site shall be provided; forest management plan must be approved by KC Soil Conservation district prior to approval of any subdivision within PUD	DENSITY - The 2016 development proposal is for a total residential density of 89 units (445.42 acres / 5 acres/unit = 89) which is consistent with current GMA/Comp Plan definition for rural lands. The proposal provides for clustering of density with lot sizes as small as 22,000 sf per SFR and ranging up to 95 acres. AIRPORT SAFTY ZONE - Those areas (ASZ-4) impacted by Airport operations and not suitable for residential uses are proposed to be RV storage, RV park and campgrounds uses. PROPOSED USES - The 2016 development proposal provides for a diversity of uses from 22,000sf lot residential to larger acreage residential parcels, multi-family/attached housing and RV related uses. OPEN SPACE - Included in the proposal is 21.83 acres remaining in dedicated open space for wildlife and recreational/aesthetic qualities which provides for community trails, buffers and wildlife corridors.	

No.	ELEMENT ADDRESSED IN COUNTY'S MAY 20, 2011 LETTER	<i>Summary of Impacts (From County 5/20/11 letter)</i>	Summary of Possible Mitigation	Applicant Response (Alternative Mitigation)	County Initial Response ¹
		<i>assuring that resource use can continue without proximity impacts such as noise to adjacent rural lands.</i>		TRAILS - The 2016 proposal also includes in excess of 5000lf of internal private trails for the immediate community use. These internal trails would be included as community tracts.	
9	Housing	<i>Housing - FEIS did not identify significant housing impacts.</i>	compliance with applicable laws and standards	The 2016 Marian Meadows proposal is consistent with rural standards of 1 unit per 5 acres but includes clustering with small and large SFR parcels providing for diversity within the project. The proposal includes open space parcels, trails and community tracts for parks and community uses, campground and RV park facilities and RV Storage and supporting services.	<i>No mitigation is recommended beyond compliance with applicable laws and standards.</i>
10	Aesthetics	<i>Aesthetics - FEIS discloses that the current proposal would have the most substantial impacts during construction and that residential construction will also take place in areas visible from I-90 and much of the surrounding community.</i>	alternative 4 has the least amount of visual impacts	The 2016 development proposal provides for RV and recreational uses along the southern boundary line and ½ acre or larger sized parcels north of this area. The eastern 2/3rds of the property will consist of 4 large parcels. Building setbacks and buffering are provided next to existing SF uses. The interior of the plat will feature a community park.	

No.	ELEMENT ADDRESSED IN COUNTY'S MAY 20, 2011 LETTER	<i>Summary of Impacts (From County 5/20/11 letter)</i>	Summary of Possible Mitigation	Applicant Response (Alternative Mitigation)	County Initial Response ¹
11	Light & Glare	<i>Light & Glare - FEIS did not identify significant impacts associated with light and glare.</i>	outdoor lighting shall be shielded and directed downward	Construction standards for down ward facing fixtures.	
12	Recreation	<p><i>Recreation - The proposed development has a range of potentially significant adverse impacts on Park and Recreation demand and facilities. Park and recreation demand of the proposed PUD with 443 lots would result in a demand for 0.44 miles of trails and 3.6 acres of parks under Kittitas County standards and would result in a demand for 9.9 to 14.1 acres of parks under National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) Guidelines with full time residential tenure within the development. This level of recreational facilities has not been provided on or offsite.</i></p> <p><i>Park and recreation demand at the allowed rural density with about 147 lots would result in a demand for 0.2 miles of trails and 1.4 acres of parks under Kittitas County standards and would result in a demand for 2.4 to 4.1 acres of parks under National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) Guidelines with full time residential tenure within the development. This level of recreational facilities has not been provided on or offsite.</i></p> <p><i>The lack of adequate on-site recreation facilities would result in a lack of recreational opportunities for residence and overburden the existing limited active recreation facilities</i></p>	each subdivision phase within PUD shall provide park acreage and facilities to meet N+C18RPA guidelines of FEIS table 3-17 for full-time residential units; off-road public trail shall be provided within a central portion of property running North/South and connect with BPA easement east; off-road public trail shall be provided along BPA easement providing a management plan to limit use during spring and fall elk migration	<p>The 2016 proposal provides for 24.45 acres of combined use community land. Within these areas, 2.63 acres are dedicated to park areas, community building and associated uses and 21.82 acres to dedicated open space. This exceeds the suggested recreational needs as outlined in Table 3-17 of the FEIS pertaining to the NRPA Standards and Guidelines.</p> <p>Those regions of steeper slopes, stream corridors, associated wetlands, wildlife corridors and in general areas deemed to be Critical Areas under KCC 17A and RCW 36.70A will mainly be contained within the 4 large SF parcels on the eastern 2/3rds of the site. Any development in or associated with these areas will be conducted under the oversight of specialized discipline pertaining to areas of impact.</p> <p><u>Trails</u>-Internal community based trails dedicated to pedestrian uses or winter time motorized uses will be provided from each development parcel to a centrally located community park and community buildings. Community trails adjacent to or included within the BPA transmission line area will be in close proximity to identified wildlife corridors; these trails will be confined to the western most 20' of the easement and will not be used for power line maintenance traffic.</p> <p><u>MT Baldy RV Park, Storage and Campground</u>- This subset of the 2016 proposal provides primarily for RV storage</p>	

No.	ELEMENT ADDRESSED IN COUNTY'S MAY 20, 2011 LETTER	<i>Summary of Impacts (From County 5/20/11 letter)</i>	Summary of Possible Mitigation	Applicant Response (Alternative Mitigation)	<i>County Initial Response¹</i>
		<i>in the Easton community.</i>		<p>by community ownership or via a member/owner driven organization. The storage element is confined to that area within Airport Safety Zone 4 and will not allow for overnight uses. For owners or members, an RV Park and Campground is proposed for that area beyond ASZ 4 but still classified as a hazard area from airport operations within ASZ 6. The park and campground will allow for short term stays with associated and dedicated recreational areas.</p> <p><u>Community Buildings</u> – Community buildings will include but not be limited to centralized mail delivery and pickup location, community based point of use recycling and solid waste disposal, pool and play courts.</p>	
13	Historic & Cultural Preservation	<i>Historic & Cultural Preservation - The FEIS did not identify significant historic and cultural preservation impacts; however only approximately 220 acres was surveyed for archaeological resources and some areas included in the various Alternatives have not been surveyed (e.g., Alternative 4 includes some lot areas that are not included in the</i>	preparation of a plan for limited subsurface testing in areas of high probability of historic resources; preparation of an inadvertent discover plan to be followed if archaeological resources are identified with contact list	<p><i>We agree that a plan will be formulated for the discovery of surface or sub-surface archaeological resources.</i></p> <p>The area ear-marked for development has undergone extensive disturbance from logging activity as recently as 20 years ago. Expectations of finding surface archaeological resources are deemed to be very remote.</p>	<p><i>i) Preparation of a plan for limited subsurface testing of areas of high probability for containing precontact and historic resources.</i></p> <p><i>ii) Preparation of an inadvertent discover plan which states applicable state laws and the proper procedures that are to be followed if archaeological resources are identified. A contact list of the appropriate parties should</i></p>

No.	ELEMENT ADDRESSED IN COUNTY'S MAY 20, 2011 LETTER	<i>Summary of Impacts (From County 5/20/11 letter)</i>	Summary of Possible Mitigation	Applicant Response (Alternative Mitigation)	<i>County Initial Response¹</i>
		<i>area shown in Figure 9: Walkover Transect Survey of the September 22, 2006 Reiss-Landreau Research survey). Also, subsequent to issuance of the FEIS, comment were received from the Department of Archaeology & Historic Preservation (DAHP) and the Yakama Nation.</i>			<i>be included.</i>
14A	Transportation	<i>14.1 Pedestrian Facilities</i>	an emergency access route shall be provided via Silver Creek Road which bridges Silver Creek to cross either Easton State Airport or National Forest land; roadway minimum width is 56 feet from bottom of slope to first road intersection at top of slope for eastern portion of property; maximum roadway grade is 10 percent	The 2016 Development proposal provides for roadway alignment and layout as delineated in KCC 12.04. The primary plat access point is via Sparks Road with a designed public road extending north ±1050 lf. Interior roadways will be private and of hard surfacing or gravel as shown on the plat map.	<i>County has authority to require pedestrian facilities under KCC 12.01.170, beyond these facilities, no additional mitigation is recommended.</i>

No.	ELEMENT ADDRESSED IN COUNTY'S MAY 20, 2011 LETTER	<i>Summary of Impacts (From County 5/20/11 letter)</i>	Summary of Possible Mitigation	Applicant Response (Alternative Mitigation)	County Initial Response ¹
		<p><i>14.2 Fire Access – The proposed development is likely to have significant adverse impacts on life and property as summarized below and under Section 15.1 Public Services: Fire.</i></p> <p><i>The Marian Meadows site is served by a single access point consisting of Sparks Road which has a potential blockage point at the Silver Creek bridge, which is substandard in width. A blockage of the bridge would interrupt all vehicular access to the site. No formal alternative access is provided.</i></p> <p><i>Potential alternative access is available during summer through the Easton State Airport to Silver Creek Road, which has an additional bridge over Silver Creek.</i></p> <p><i>Fire response time to the steep eastern portion of the site would be affected by road grade and the potential for the only potential access to be impeded by accidents, particularly in an emergency situation where escaping residents and emergency response movements may conflict. Intense fires could make the single access road unusable due to the proximity of heat and flames.</i></p> <p><i>These existing conditions along with the proposed development present the potential for significant adverse environmental impacts.</i></p>			<p><i>i) To mitigate significant potential risks to property and life safety from additional development with Sparks Road as the single access point, particularly with the risk of road blockage at the Silver Creek bridge, prior to subdivision or other development within the PUD an additional emergency access route shall be provided via Silver Creek Road which bridges Silver Creek either across the Easton State Airport or across National Forest Land.</i></p> <p><i>ii) To mitigate significant potential risks to property and life safety resulting from development of the steeply sloping easterly portion of the site with a single roadway access that would render both escape and response difficult or impossible if blocked, roadway access to the eastern part of the site shall include a roadway minimum width from the bottom of the slope to the first road intersection at the top of the slope of a minimum width of 56 feet.</i></p> <p><i>iii) To mitigate significant potential risks to property and life safety of development of the steeply sloping easterly portion of the site due to delayed response time on roadways with steep grades, the maximum roadway grade within the site shall be ten (10) percent.</i></p>
14B	Aviation	<p><i>14.3 Aviation – The proposed PUD is within Airport Safety Zones (ASZs) 3, 4 and 6 of the Easton State Airport. The area within ASZ 4 in alignment with the runway represents the greatest threat to potential future residents</i></p>	no development in ASZ 3 or 4; density limited to 1 unit per three gross acres in any ASZ	<p>The 2016 proposed development addresses airport operations in the following ways; - ASZ-4. any and all development within ASZ 4 will be limited to Storage facilities and community support structures like community recycling with restrictions on overnight use.</p>	<p><i>i) In order to minimize hazards to life and property from airport operations, any subdivision or other development within the PUD site shall prohibit residential development within ASZ 3 and 4. Other</i></p>

No.	ELEMENT ADDRESSED IN COUNTY'S MAY 20, 2011 LETTER	<i>Summary of Impacts (From County 5/20/11 letter)</i>	Summary of Possible Mitigation	Applicant Response (Alternative Mitigation)	County Initial Response ¹
		<p><i>located within the area from aircraft operation. Because of altitude and heat effects known as "high and hot," in which air density reduces the amount of lift generated by the wings of an airplane or the rotors of a helicopter, greater hazard is present along the alignment of the runway, including ASZ 4 and the area extending beyond ASZ 4.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed PUD exceeds both Kittitas County and WSDOT recommended densities in ASZs with 72 lots in the highest hazard ASZs 3 and 4.</i></p> <p><i>Accommodating the allowed density under Kittitas County Zoning of one unit per three acres within the ASZs increases risk as compared to the WSDOT recommendation of one unit per 5 acres. However, reduction in density in the ASZs to the WSDOT recommendation while providing the same overall density within the PUD increases the amount of development in more steeply sloping portions of the site outside of ASZs with greater potential geologic hazards and wildfire hazard.</i></p> <p><i>Avoidance of all development in ASZ 4 reduces hazard exposure in the area of highest risk along the alignment of the runway. Lots partially within ASZ 3 can be configured to eliminate building sites within the ASZ. These provisions, together with maximum density within ASZ 6 of one unit per 3 acres provides an acceptable balance between aviation safety impacts and impacts on geologic hazards and wildfire hazards of</i></p>		<p><u>-ASZ 6</u> – That region extending beyond ASZ 4 and subject to aircraft over flight will be restricted to RV and campsite usage with limited stay potential.</p> <p><u>-ASZ 3 & 6-</u> Those areas located north of ASZ 4 will contain all of residential development use. Under RCW 14.12.090 (1) expectation would be for aircraft to turn away from the 2000' elevation rise east of the Plat of Marian Meadows. This would be especially true for aircraft in distress. All residential construction will be confined to north of ASZ 4, and restricted from areas under the flight path beyond ASZ 4.</p> <p><u>Height Restrictions</u> – Plat restrictions will be in place limiting structure to 35' or under. (See Airport Exh.)</p>	<p><i>compatible development such as mini-storage may be located in those ASZs and lots may include those ASZs, as long as residential use is excluded.</i></p> <p>ii) <i>In order to minimize hazards from life and property from airport operations, the maximum density within all portions of the site encumbered by ASZs shall be no more than an average density of one unit per three gross acres.</i></p>

No.	ELEMENT ADDRESSED IN COUNTY'S MAY 20, 2011 LETTER	<i>Summary of Impacts (From County 5/20/11 letter)</i>	Summary of Possible Mitigation	Applicant Response (Alternative Mitigation)	County Initial Response ¹
		<i>shifting development to steeper portions of the site outside of the ASZs. These existing conditions along with the proposed development present the potential for significant adverse environmental impacts.</i>			
15A	Public Service - Fire	<i>15.1 Fire – The proposed development is likely to have significant adverse impacts on life and property as summarized below and discussed fully in the Final EIS. Fire impacts associated with Transportation are contained above under Section 14 Transportation. The addition of residences adds to the incidence of fire as well as the demands placed on the fire district to control these fires. The Proposed PUD with 443 units adds about 30 percent to the number of potential sources of residential fires in the Eason fire District. The entire area is subject to risk of wildfire because of the vegetation community in the area. The risk is greater in the steep eastern portion of the site. The ability of the fire district to respond to fires and suppress them is a major factor in risk to life and property. The suppression of fires early in the process or through automatic sprinkler systems provides a substantial decrease in risk for structural fires and reduces greatly the risk of fire spread. In areas served by volunteer fire departments where the response time and number of personnel available may be highly variable, built-in suppression can compensate for lack of assurance of effective response. The ability of the Easton Fire District to effectively respond is also currently limited by</i>	all development within PUD shall have fire sprinklers; mitigation payment, at time of filing for final, shall be paid to the Easton Fire District to be deposited in a mitigation account with the County Treasurer; wildfire protection plan shall be developed for entire site and approved by KC Fire Marshall and DNR	<p>The fire district should be consulted and a distinction should be made between the existing lack of services without the PUD and any increase in services due to the PUD. We will need to work with the Fire Marshall to understand what a wildfire protection plan entails since, to our knowledge, they have not been required or produced for our county.</p> <p>The 2016 development proposal, in accordance with Resolution #030796-2 provides for a substantial upgrade to the existing Kittitas County Water District #3 system with looped distribution through the plat, providing for the addition of 100,000 gallons of storage with upgraded water service levels throughout the district.</p> <p>Community Building restrictions will also require Class A roof surfaces, design standards for buildings with limited separations to other buildings and or foliage and dedicated fire lanes and zones. Multi-family residential and storage facilities will include design standards between units with fire impacts as a focus, designed fire lanes and zones and layout of internal fire hydrant layout and approval from County Fire Marshall.</p> <p>The applicant realizes that the ability of the Easton Fire District is limited and that any development needs to consider impact to the Department and the ability to respond to fire and emergency incidents. Building and design standards can be implemented to mitigate much of these issues. The simple development of this plat will significantly increases the tax base and subsequent revenues of the Department over a ten</p>	<p>i) <i>To mitigate potential fire and life safety impacts, all development within the PUD shall be provided with fire sprinklers in accordance with the International Fire Code Section.</i></p> <p>ii) <i>In order to provide for mitigation of impacts on fire protection facilities and equipment proportionate to the impacts produced by the project, at the time of filing of a final subdivision or approval of other development within the PUD a mitigation payment shall be made to the Easton Fire District, to be deposited in a designated mitigation account with the County Treasurer to provide mitigation proportionate to the impacts of the proposal for additional equipment and fire station expansion. The payments may be spent only on new equipment and facilities and administered in accordance with RCW 82.02.070.01. Provided that if Kittitas County adopts a fire impact fee in accordance with RCW 82.02, said fees shall take the place of this mitigation payment for lots within phases for which a final plat has not been filed at the time of institution of said fee.</i></p> <p>iii) <i>To mitigate significant potential risks to property and life safety from wildfire risk on the PUD site a wildfire protection plan shall be developed for the entire site and approved by the Fire Marshall and the Washington Department of Natural</i></p>

No.	ELEMENT ADDRESSED IN COUNTY'S MAY 20, 2011 LETTER	<i>Summary of Impacts (From County 5/20/11 letter)</i>	Summary of Possible Mitigation	Applicant Response (Alternative Mitigation)	<i>County Initial Response¹</i>
		<p><i>having only one modern fully equipped fire truck. Any additional development in the area warrants acquisition of additional equipment. These existing conditions along with the proposed development present the potential for significant adverse environmental impacts regarding fire.</i></p>		<p>year period and on into the future.</p> <p>The inclusion of interior fire sprinklers (RV Complex and Townhome structures only) provides for immediate life safety for those within a structure but allows for limited or no protection of external elements. The applicant suggest that fire mitigations be focus to building and material designs to protect dwelling units from impacts to other units and provisions for access and egress during emergency periods.</p>	<p><i>Resources. The provision of the plan shall be implemented for each subdivision prior to final plat approval and for each residence prior to occupancy.</i></p> <p><i>iv) In order to provide for mitigation of impacts on fire protection facilities and equipment proportionate to the impacts produced by the project, the amount of said fire equipment mitigation payment shall be determined by the following formula:</i></p> <p><i>Units x PI x EC = Fire Equipment Mitigation Payment</i></p> <p><i>Where:</i></p> <p><i>Units = number of residential units</i></p> <p><i>PI = Proportional Increase as determined by the Easton Fire District is the number of residential units currently served by the fire</i></p>

SEPA
 MARIAN MEADOWS MITIGATION MEASURES

For Discussions Purposes Only – Sept 10, 2016
 Regular text *prepared by Applicant*
 Italics font text *prepared by County*
 Revisions and additions for 2016 proposal

No.	ELEMENT ADDRESSED IN COUNTY'S MAY 20, 2011 LETTER	<i>Summary of Impacts</i> <i>(From County 5/20/11 letter)</i>	Summary of Possible Mitigation	Applicant Response <i>(Alternative Mitigation)</i>	<i>County Initial Response¹</i>
					<i>district divided by units</i> <i>EC = Equipment Cost as determined by the</i> <i>Easton Fire District shall be the most</i> <i>recent acquisition cost of a standard Fire</i> <i>Engine fully equipped by the district or a</i> <i>comparable district in Kittitas County or</i> <i>representative area</i>

No.	ELEMENT ADDRESSED IN COUNTY'S MAY 20, 2011 LETTER	<i>Summary of Impacts (From County 5/20/11 letter)</i>	Summary of Possible Mitigation	Applicant Response (Alternative Mitigation)	<i>County Initial Response¹</i>
15B	Public Service - Schools	<i>15.2 Schools – The proposed development has a range of potential adverse impacts on schools. Approval of a PUD with up to 443 lots occupied by full-time residents would require increasing the capacity of the existing school to serve about 260 additional students, about 2 and a half times the present capacity. The residential community that might result if PUD approval for this property provides the precedent for similar development of other properties would result in up to 850 additional students resulting in an increase of about 8 times the existing capacity. There is no assurance of state funding of school expansion. If available, such funding would generally cover up to 70 percent of the cost. The cost of instruction and transportation would increase proportionally to the increase in the number of students.</i>	mitigation payment, at time of filing for final, shall be paid to the Easton School District to be deposited in a mitigation account with the County Treasurer; school transportation mitigation (buses)	<p>The school district should be consulted and any payment should be fully justified. There should be a distinction made for the existing lack of facilities for existing students vs. any increase in students. The tenure alternatives do not fully substantiate the increase in students and the need for additional facilities.</p> <p><i>The 2016 development proposal is for 89 dwelling units which is most closely represented within the FEIS as Alternate #5. The applicant's expectations are that Tenure Scenario #4 as delineated in Table 3-18 will best represent expectations for this proposal with the majority of residential use being seasonal/recreation in its early stages.</i></p> <p><i>In relationship to school impacts, the expected increase in the near term for student enrollment will most likely bring levels back to those of 2003 with 123 students.</i></p>	<p>i) In order to provide for mitigation of impacts on school facilities proportionate to the impacts produced by the project, at the time of filing of a final subdivision or approval of other development within the PUD a mitigation payment shall be made to the Easton School District, to be deposited in a designated mitigation account with the County Treasurer to mitigate the facility impacts of the proposal. The payments may be spent only on new school facilities and administered in accordance with RCW 82.02.070.01. Provided that if Kittitas County adopts a school impact fee in accordance with RCW 82.02, said fees shall take the place of this mitigation payment for lots within phases for which a final plat has not been filed at the time of institution of said fee.</p> <p>(ii) provide for mitigation of impacts on school facilities, building and equipment, proportionate to the impacts produced by the project.</p> <p>(iii) provide for mitigation of impacts on school transportation facilities proportionate to the impacts produced by the project.</p>
15C	Public Service – Police & Public Safety	<i>15.3 Police & Public Safety - Impacts are relatively minor from a cumulative perspective.</i>	no applicant mitigation	No mitigation	<i>Because there is a limited direct mitigation that could be accomplished by the project, mitigation is likely to be primarily a general government expense related to growth as a whole and not readily segregated for this development.</i>
15D	Public Service - Medical Response	<i>15.4 Medical Response - Impacts are relatively minor from a cumulative perspective.</i>	no applicant mitigation	no mitigation	<i>Because there is limited direct mitigation that could be accomplished by the project, mitigation is likely to be primarily a special district expense related to growth as a whole and not readily segregated for this development.</i>

No.	ELEMENT ADDRESSED IN COUNTY'S MAY 20, 2011 LETTER	<i>Summary of Impacts (From County 5/20/11 letter)</i>	Summary of Possible Mitigation	Applicant Response (Alternative Mitigation)	County Initial Response ¹
16A	Utilities - Wastewater Treatment	Wastewater Treatment - The proposed development has potential significant adverse impacts on health and safety from the proposed means of sewage disposal. The operation of a sewage treatment facility, as proposed, poses substantial risk of failure to adequately perform due to the need for regular and skilled operation and maintenance with additional risk of failure due to variable flows.	concern with management of reclaimed wastewater facility; prior to development/subdivision of steeper eastern portion, a sewage disposal master plan shall be developed and approved by KC Public Health	Sewer will be treated with on-site sewer systems (residential applications) and a Large On Site Septic System (RV Complex) as delineated in KCC 13.08..	<p>i) <i>The consequences of inadequate treatment of sewage with the proposed re-use of sewage poses a potential significant health risk to persons that may come into contact with inadequately treated sewage. Use of such a system requires further evaluation and inclusion of various strategies as outlined in the FEIS (pg 3-189 &3-190) prior to any subdivision or other development. On site sewage disposal shall be provided for development meeting standards in effect at the time that specific on-site sewage disposal permits are processed.</i></p> <p>ii) <i>In order to address constraints of limited adequate soils, prior to any subdivision or other development on the steeper easterly portion of the site a sewage disposal master plan shall be developed indicating lots to be served by individual and shared drainfields and shall reserve needed areas and conditions for shared drainfields at specifically designated locations. This plan shall be submitted to Kittitas County Public Health for review and approval.</i></p>
16B	Utilities - Stormwater	Stormwater	implementation of the Stormwater Manual for Eastern WA	Agree	<i>Implementation of the Ecology Stormwater Manual for Eastern Washington should provide sufficient mitigation for events not related to alluvial fans or debris flow.</i>
16C	Utilities - Solid Waste	<i>Solid Waste - Impacts are relatively minor from a cumulative perspective.</i>	no applicant mitigation	2016 Development proposal includes a point of use recycling center for solid waste and product recycling. This will eliminate curb side service whereby reducing traffic and carbon concerns. Added advantage will be garbage controls in a rural setting with better management of people and wildlife.	<i>Because there is limited direct mitigation that could be accomplished by the project, mitigation is likely to be primarily a general government expense related to growth as a whole and not readily segregated for this development.</i>

SEPA
MARIAN MEADOWS MITIGATION MEASURES

For Discussions Purposes Only – Sept 10, 2016
Regular text *prepared by Applicant*
Italics font text prepared by County
Revisions and additions for 2016 proposal

No.	ELEMENT ADDRESSED IN COUNTY'S MAY 20, 2011 LETTER	<i>Summary of Impacts (From County 5/20/11 letter)</i>	Summary of Possible Mitigation	Applicant Response (Alternative Mitigation)	<i>County Initial Response¹</i>
16D	Utilities - Electrical, Communication, Visual Quality	<i>Electrical, Communication, Visual Quality</i>	mitigation by service provider and financed by utility charges	Agree	<i>Mitigation will be accomplished by the utility provider and financed by system-wide utility charges.</i>