

From: [Beverly Kluth](#)
To: [CDS User](#); [Jamey Ayling](#)
Cc: [Jeff Kluth](#)
Subject: Fwd: Fowler Creek Guest Ranch (CU 23-00003) - corrections
Date: Monday, October 2, 2023 2:14:43 PM

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.

Hi,

I see that I dropped off some information in my original email and have included it below.

Thanks,
Bev

Begin forwarded message:

From: Beverly Kluth <mrsbeldar@icloud.com>
Subject: **Fowler Creek Guest Ranch (CU 23-00003).**
Date: October 2, 2023 at 1:22:19 PM PDT
To: cds@co.kittitas.wa.us, Jamey.ayling@co.kittitas.wa.us
Cc: Jeff Kluth <beldar20001@icloud.com>

Hi,

My name is Bev Kluth and I live at 101 Forest Lane in the Goat Peak Ranch area just off Zrebric Road.

I strongly oppose cu-23-0003 for many reasons. I've reviewed the documents and have listed specific concerns and unclear areas in my feedback below on each exhibit.

Exhibit 1 - Fowler Creek Narrative

By its own admission in this exhibit, it's located in a watershed that is home to a number of important wetlands. That should be reason enough to deny CU-23-00003. I feel the current zoning of this area, rural 5, should immediately quash approval for this proposal, based upon the purpose and intent section of 17.30a.010, which reads: The purpose and intent of the Rural-5 zone is to provide areas where residential development may occur on a low

density basis. A primary goal and intent in siting R-5 zones will be to minimize adverse effects on adjacent natural resource lands. (Ord. 2005-05, 2005)

Has the Department of Fish and Wildlife or the Department of Ecology been apprised of this and asked to weigh in?

The section also states that the proposal is committed to eliminating motorized wheeled recreation vehicles within the boundaries of this resort while it provides access on a trail that leads to FS 4517 to the surrounding areas. They are basically providing a trailering spot for additional ATVs to drive all over the area, on private property, back by the power lines, etc., which will increase noise and negatively impact wildlife. So basically no ATV or 4 wheeled traffic on the 84 acre resort, while increasing the number of ATV and other motorized recreational vehicles in the entire surrounding area.

Snowmobiling will be allowed on the 84 acre resort but when snow is on the ground it is virtually impossible to detect boundary lines meaning that they are again, basically providing a trailering location for snowmobiles to access the surrounding areas, including the wetlands. This will add noise not to mention the impact on local wildlife and trespassing issues on the private property that surrounds this 84 acre parcel.

They note that campfires aren't allowed during high fire danger times but they are providing some propane fire pits throughout the resort, available during burn bans. (Mentioned in Exhibit 7).

The last paragraph of Exhibit 1 states that they are 'reducing traffic and tourist congestion...'. This is a falsehood, there is absolutely no fact based evidence in any of the documents that shows a reduction of traffic and tourist congestion.

Exhibit 7, Fowler Creek Guest Ranch Buildings and Recreation Facilities

This exhibit raises many concerns with the biggest one being increased danger of wildfires being caused by visitors. In the paragraph starting with 'Firepits', it describes them being located throughout the ranch and doesn't say where. It also states that some fire pits will have propane gas to power the flames during burn bans. This grim scenario of having tourists lighting fires throughout 84 acres of land surrounded by 5 acre residential lots and expecting them to follow burn ban rules and/or fire pit safety rules in order to avoid starting a wildfire is irresponsible and reckless. There is nothing in the entire plan that discusses mitigation for fire danger. No wildfire prevention or mitigation information in any of the documents.

I am not only concerned about the loss of life, property and ecosystems due to increased wildfire risk with this plan but I am also concerned about how my home owners insurance rate will be impacted by this increased risk factor. Many folks in our area are unable to get protection for fire damage for their properties and I am concerned that possibility for homes in the Goat Peak Ranch Division and others that would be on the perimeter of this proposed resort.

Exhibit 8. Fowler Creek Guest Ranch Domestic Water Plan and Exhibit 9 Fowler Creek Sewage Treatment Plan

In paragraph 4 of Exhibit 8 it addresses recreational vehicle sites, it is noted that electrical connections and sewage connections will be provided but the RVs will need to provide their

own domestic water which will be collected through the wastewater sewage treatment system provided by Fowler Creek Guest Ranch. Exhibit 9 Fowler Creek Sewage Treatment Plan has no information on what sewage plan will be enacted when this project is started. It discusses calculations done by using the United States Geological Survey publication 'Estimating Water Use in the United States: 2015 Round of the National Water Use Compilation'. Who did these calculations, the applicant and if so, it has no credibility. More details by an accredited source should be mandated along with using a more recent source than 2015.

Exhibit 12, Fowler Creek Guest Ranch Traffic

I am not seeing anything that addresses the existing problem of traffic congestion on West Side Road over summer weekends. This was written using old information on traffic counts and counts that were done in the month of September, which is when traffic is at it's minimum around these parts. West Side Road traffic problems will be more compounded if this proposal is approved. The traffic counts referenced in this exhibit are old and were performed in September. This information is unreliable and relatively useless in terms of impact.

What authority performed this write-up and analysis of the traffic measurement using the Trip General Manual which is what Exhibit 12 states was used to determine traffic? The applicant? If so, is he an accredited transportation engineer? I would expect that a Traffic Impact Study be prepared by an accredited transportation engineer before Kittitas County would take any of the information in Exhibit 12 as factual and reliable.

Exhibit 12, section A, (iii) states that the only truck traffic that will occur is during the build of this resort. That is just wildly untrue. Large RVs and trucks pulling RVs, trucks pulling trailers with snowmobiles and ATVs will continually be going in and out all the time.

Exhibit 12 also references traffic counts at Westside Road and Zrebic Road from September 2020, which should not be considered as it was during the pandemic, was done in September when traffic is lower because school starts and also is old information.

Exhibit 15 - Residential Habitats: A Unique and Memorable Experience

This exhibit is missing much information. It doesn't even list how many of these residential habits (RHs) there will be, it's necessary to review Exhibit 16, Site Plan where I count 8 of them, one is smack dab in the middle of what is designated as Wetlands on the map. Will water or toilet facilities be available for these and if so where? How are the sewage concerns addressed in an ecologically safe manner since these habitats will be situated closer to wild life areas and wetlands? Will there be lights at each habitat? Will they be heated and if so, how? Will these be open year round? Was vehicle traffic by these tourists staying in these habitations added to the numbers in Exhibit 12? This is so very unclear and unacceptable. I'd really like to know what the Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Department of Ecology would have to say about this exhibit, are they aware of this plan?

Exhibit 16 - Site Plan

This exhibit doesn't provide enough detail about the entrances/exits to this resort. In the document titled 'SURROUNDING PROPERTY REVIEW there is reference to an east entrance, west entrance, and a north activities location. There is no indication on the site plan for an east entrance, west entrance or a north activities notation. It's not clear where entrances and exits will exist.

Exhibit 21 - Fowler Creek Guest Ranch Recreational and Rural Character

The first paragraph of this exhibit implies that it addresses Kittitas County residents, it's not, it's for bringing in tourists from other areas to recreate in Kittitas County as a way for the applicant to make money. It will actually lessen the ability of Kittitas County residents to enjoy the existing rural character and recreational opportunities by creating this resort in the middle of R5 property, for use by paying customers, not existing Kittitas County residents. It will destroy the rural character of this area as I know it and will also make it less safe.

The paragraph about the East Lake Sammamish Trail V. King County, 193 WN.2D 129 (2019) is totally not applicable to this proposal. It is not an apples to apples comparison and I find it absurd and a bit amusing that it is in this proposal. There is no railroad bed that exists on this land. In fact, we have the Palouse to Cascades Trail that is nearby running parallel to I90. If one were to hold the county responsible for preserving the rural character of this area of Upper Kittitas County it would find that this proposal degrades the rural character while promoting recreational opportunities to non-Kittitas County residents. This is a plan to develop a resort that will likely pollute the wetlands it is near, increase wildfire danger, cause noise and light pollution, and increase traffic while ruining the rural character for the residents, all for the profit of this applicant.