

Dan Valoff

From: Jan Ollivier
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2012 11:10 AM
To: 'Wayne Nelsen'
Cc: Christina Wollman; Dan Valoff; Kirk Holmes
Subject: RE: Big Buck Ridge (P-07-40) SEPA Review

Wayne:

The Big Buck applicant should reference the City Heights EIS traffic data - but it can't be used as a substitute for the requirement.

The City Heights traffic study identifies its impacts on Cle Elum streets and the development agreement states their proportional cost to mitigate these impacts. Also, the City Heights traffic study says it considered pipe line projects - but it didn't indicate that Big Buck was considered within that background development growth. So the LOS analysis may or may not include the traffic impacts from Big Buck (an increase of about 134 ADT). And the City Heights impacts would be more widely dispersed due to the layout of their proposal.

We need to know the specific traffic impacts that Big Buck has on the system. Also, the SEPA requirements that were applied to the Big Buck Ridge Cluster Plat from the Andrus Rezone must be addressed. These were as follows:

- I. Transportation (C) At the time of a project action, the applicant shall submit a stamped traffic analysis from a licensed engineer in the State of Washington considering among other factors, intersection spacing, sight distances, traffic volumes, load bearing capacity of soils, pavement thickness design, etc. Reference current Kittitas County Road Standards.

The City Heights traffic analysis does have data that can be used by Big Buck, and should be included to determine the background traffic growth anticipated at full build out. But there is a lot more information that the applicant must convey to the County that is not provided in another development's traffic analysis. More information is needed to consider the specific development's traffic impacts, to determine whether or not the project can receive approval, and to identify mitigation measures.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Jan Ollivier
Transportation Manager
Kittitas County
509-962-7523

From: Wayne Nelsen [mailto:wnelsen@encompasses.net]
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2012 12:17 PM
To: Jan Ollivier
Cc: Christina Wollman; Dan Valoff
Subject: Big Buck Ridge (P-07-40) SEPA Review

Jan:

I met with Dan and Christina this morning to discuss the SEPA review for Big Buck Ridge (P-07-40). As part of the MDNS issued for the underlying non-project rezone (Z-06-23) of the subject property, a TIA would be required at the time of project action. However, since that MDNS was issued, the Final EIS for City Heights has been adopted, which addresses the exact roadways in question serving Big Buck Ridge. As such, I would suggest that the environmental information already prepared is sufficient for the county to proceed with their threshold determination for Big Buck Ridge. The following information is provided from DOE's SEPA Handbook:

2.7 Use of Existing Documents

It is often possible to use existing documents to satisfy all or part of the requirements of SEPA. Existing environmental documents that analyze all or part of the environmental impacts of a proposal may be adopted, addended, or incorporated by reference. If there are any remaining environmental concerns, they can be addressed in supplemental analysis—such as a supplemental EIS or by an addendum issued with the new threshold determination.

The use of existing documents is particularly important for GMA cities and counties that have completed environmental analysis for their comprehensive plans and development regulations. This analysis should be used as the starting point for review of individual projects, allowing project review to focus on just those aspects that have not yet been addressed. GMA cities and counties also have available the new Planned Action process, where formal SEPA review is completed prior to proponents submitting permit applications for specific projects.

SEPA documents do not have expiration dates. After SEPA is completed, if a proposal is delayed so that new permits must be applied for, environmental review may be limited to verifying that there is no new information, regulatory changes, or changes to the proposal that would require additional review. (This is true even if the applicant has changed.) As long as there are no changes to be addressed, no additional paperwork is required and agencies may proceed with permit decisions [WAC 197-11-600].

2.7.2 Incorporation by Reference

Incorporation by reference [WAC 197-11-625 and 754] is very similar in substance to adopting a document, in that all, or part, of the incorporated document becomes part of the agency environmental documentation for a proposal. Unlike the adoption process that is limited to environmental documents issued under either SEPA or NEPA, any information may be incorporated by reference. This may include any study or report that provides information relevant to a proposal.

To incorporate documents by reference, the document must be identified in the current checklist, threshold determination, or EIS, and the content briefly described. The adoption form is not used.

Thanks for your consideration of this matter and please let me know if you have any questions or need additional information.

Wayne Nelsen

WNelsen@EncompassES.net

Encompass Engineering & Surveying

Together With

Baima & Holmberg

Western Washington Division | 165 NE Juniper Street, Suite 201 | Issaquah, WA 98027 | Phone: (425) 392-0250 | Fax: (425) 391-3055

Eastern Washington Division | 108 East 2nd Street | Cle Elum, WA 98922 | Phone: (509) 674-7433 | Fax: (509) 674-7419

Encompass Engineering & Surveying, its officers or agents shall not be responsible for the accuracy or completeness of electronic file copies.

Due to the potential that information exchanged by electronic media can deteriorate, be damaged, lost or modified, intentionally or otherwise, use of this electronic data by anyone other than Encompass Engineering & Surveying shall be at the sole risk of such user and without liability or legal exposure to Encompass Engineering & Surveying. The recipient is responsible for verifying the accuracy of data against governing hard copy documentation. If there is a discrepancy between the hard copy and the electronic copy, the hard copy will govern. Recipient assumes all risks in the changing or modification of data and revisions or updating of hard copy documents.

Notice: All email sent to this address will be received by the Kittitas County email system and may be subject to public disclosure under Chapter 42.56 RCW and to archiving and review.

message id: 3CE145910000b0d4c0948b0719d004a14