

From: [Deborah Knight](#)
To: [Jamey Ayling](#)
Subject: CU23-00003
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 2:32:41 AM

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.

My name is Deborah Knight and my husband, Jim and I are property owners on Westside Road. I am writing to express my concerns related to the proposed Conditional Use Permit for the Fowler Creek Guest Ranch (CU-23-00003).

I have worked for local governments in Washington state for almost 30 years. I have a unique understanding of the steps necessary to review and approve a conditional use permit. Each project is unique and it can be challenging to evaluate and properly condition permit applications. It is equally challenging to ensure projects are developed consistent with the approved land use permits.

What strikes me about this proposal is quite simply the lack of substance with which to condition the project. It is opaque in detail and intentions and devoid of critical specifics. For example, take Exhibit 9 of the proposal, 'Sewage Treatment'. The applicant states, "As the proposed Guest Ranch continues to grow... an MBR plant **may** be constructed for all sewage treatment". Or in Exhibit 2, 'Phasing Plan', in all details of the plan, the applicant states, "The phasing plan and timeline may accelerate or decelerate depending on known and unknown factors". Essentially, the applicant is asking CDS to blanket approve any build plan, as the applicant sees fit. Exhibit 8, 'Domestic Water Plan', is not actually a plan at all, but rather a series of potential ideas for water acquisition, up to and including "Development of other water sources as allowed".

The applicant's SEPA checklist responds to questions referencing exhibits of non-committed plans, it simply leaves me with more questions than answers. There are significant SEPA issues in the application and I am challenged by the due diligence of the issuing of a Preliminary MDNS on September 20 and the intent to follow the "Optional DNS process" - providing only one round of comments, before we have appropriate and complete information to review.

Specifically, I would like to know:

1. What are the groundwater sources? Does the Department of Ecology approve of this use? Does it infringe upon neighboring water rights? Is it impactful to the water table overall? Where is the well proposed in the 'Green Zone' and what are the impacts of pumping this uphill to the development site? What about disturbed acreage?
2. The real impact on traffic and the appropriateness of the roadways. There is no professional traffic study and the numbers presented seem unrealistic.
3. A professional delineation of wetlands and the impact of this development on this. This

is a critical area, with a critical environment and threatened species. The plan acknowledges utilizing standard setbacks but simultaneously proposes building 'habitats' within them. If you look at the sewage plan, seemingly with the planned conveyance systems.

4. A professional evaluation of the noise impact on surrounding residential communities. It's largely acknowledged that forested vegetation is a poor blocker of noise conduction, and the application diminishes this impact without adequate evidence.
5. Where is the sewage treatment plan? Are the assumptions provided by the applicant realistic? They once again seem bent in the applicant's favor without merit or basis. How does this mix of commercial and residential waste play into the needs for appropriate sewage treatment? Where is it? WHERE are the proposed drain fields? How large are they? What are the risks?

Sincerely,
Deborah Knight