

September 20, 2025

Mike Kaputa, Director
Chelan County Department of Natural
Resources
SEPA Responsible Official
missionridgeeis@outlook.com
411 Washington St. Suite 201
Wenatchee, WA, 98801

RE: Mission Ridge Master Planned
Resort Expansion
Draft Environmental Impact
Statement
Concerns

Dear Mr. Kaputa,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide
comments regarding the DEIS for the
proposed development adjacent to

Mission Ridge ski area. I have found that the number of omissions of impacts, inadequate mitigation, persuasive language, and incorrect assertions are too numerous to capture. It will be difficult for any one person to comment on all the problems with the document. This comment letter is to express my disapproval of the project through just a small sample of the many issues that are problematic in the DEIS:

Traffic on Squilchuck and Mission

Ridge Road: The project predicts 10,000 vehicle trips per day on the Mission Ridge Road, which is roughly double the traffic on both Stevens Pass and Blewitt Pass. The DEIS predicts that the development will snarl traffic to a condition below minimum Chelan County standards, yet the DEIS argues for no mitigation and no improvements to the Mission Ridge Road.

The Chelan County Comprehensive Plan Goal 1.9 is “...*deny approval of any development proposal that would cause a roadway segment to fall below the adopted minimum level of service...*”. Our community should not tolerate snarled traffic that financially benefits a developer but hurts the rest of us.

Secondary Access to the development:

A second access road is required and would provide an alternate escape route if ever needed. However, the DEIS presents secondary access as an alternative. Secondary access is not an alternative; it is a code requirement. The DEIS recognizes that the second access would make a safer situation, stating in section 4.2.1.6 that: “*Having more than one evacuation route provides redundancy and increased safety, particularly during unexpected or fast-*

moving events.” Yet, the developer argues that providing a single “wider” 28-foot access road will make up for the danger of not having an emergency exit. This offering of a single “wider” road is persuasive and misleading. The current Mission Ridge Road is 28 feet wide and is not adequate for the proposed development’s traffic. The proposed “wider” road is the same width as the existing road and won’t even meet minimum County standards.

WDFW Land Exchange: Section 25 is owned by WDFW and includes the upper half of Chair 4, Windy Ridge, Bowl 4, and overlaps with the proposed project. Per the DEIS, WDFW said: “...*an expanded, year-round ski resort is not an allowable use of the land under the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) contract that*

funded WDFW's purchase of the property." Hunters use the section during archery and rifle seasons as well as for forest grouse hunting. Mule deer, Colockum Elk, golden eagles, goshawks, pika, marmots, bobcats, mountain lions, coyotes, and black bears regularly use the section's wildlife corridors. Section 25's whitebark pine forests, springs and wetlands, talus slopes, and undisturbed shrub-steppe openings are vital wildlife habitats. This section grows more important as development threatens to destroy similar habitats on adjacent parcels. The DEIS discusses a land exchange between WDFW and Washington State DNR that would result in DNR owning Section 25 and implying that an expanded year-round resort would be allowable on DNR owned Section 25. However, the DEIS further states that:

"The land swap is not part of the current

Proposed Project...". With the land exchange not on the table, and DFW indicating that expanded year-round activity is not an allowable use of Section 25, section 25 should be excluded from any expanded ski resort or development activity.

Master Planned Resort Overlay: The developer is depending on this land use strategy that allows dense urban style development outside the urban growth boundary. Without the MPR, this level of development would violate the Urban Growth Act and could not be allowed. Despite depending on this planning tool, the development violates the requirements of MPRs including: The development is not primarily a destination resort, is not self-contained, does not consist of short-term visitor accommodations, does not consider

affordable employee housing, and does not preserve the rural character or natural resource it uses.

These are just a few of the unclear, misleading, untrue, incomplete, arbitrary and persuasive statements in the DEIS. I expect Chelan County to stick to established codes and not bend the rules for the benefit of a developer. Since the development appears not possible without breaking County Codes, I urge you to select the No-Action Alternative which is the only alternative besides the full development build-out that is presented in the DEIS.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Polly Feehan
2261 8th Street SE

East Wenatchee