

Jeff Watson

From: don <dstoulil@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 6:31 AM
To: Jeff Watson
Subject: Kris Carlson application for a CUP

Dear Mr. Watson,

My name is Don Stoulil. My wife Betsy and I are property owners on McManamy Road. We are immediate neighbors of Kris Carlson the applicant.

We recently became aware of a CUP application Kris Carlson has filed with the county. We understand he would like to conduct a commercial business allowing fishing guides to use his property to access the Yakima River. In addition it appears he would like to install a campground and a horse stable.

I realize there will come an appropriate time to publicly debate the merits of such a proposal. We intend to take an active role in that debate. In the mean time I would like to bring to your attention a few "inaccuracies" I see with Mr. Carlson's application. His property does not front on Hwy 10 as claimed in his application. Access to his property is an easement across the front of my property as well as my neighbors. In addition his property does not front or provide direct access to the John Wayne Trail.

The application indicates he intends to provide horse stables for people to easily access the John Wayne Trail. However, because his property does not boarder the John Wayne trail it appears anyone boarding their horse on Mr Carlson's property would have to access the John Wayne trail over private property owned by someone else. His proposed stables will not provide potential equestrians direct access to the trail.

The application claims he anticipates 10 fishing trips per day. I challenge that claim as well. I have seen upwards of 10 vehicles on that property in the past. One trip per day requires four vehicle trips over our property. Each vehicle pulls a trailer, each truck and trailer has 6 wheels. That is equivalent to a truck/trip and a half. Ten guide trips per day will require at least forty vehicle trips per day. In addition some trips require an additional vehicle that serves as a shuttle to deliver the parked vehicle left on site. Each shuttle represents an additional two trips up and down our drive way. So the ten trips per day Mr Carlson sites, really means nearly 60 vehicle trips per day across our property. Those trips generally start around 7am and can last well into the night, certainly until 10pm or later.

Again, I realize we will have our opportunity to argue the merits of the application, but I think it is important for your department to have an early understanding of the potential negative impact this proposal will have on our quality of life. High traffic, unbearable amount of dust from the traffic and the noise from speeding trucks and trailers will dramatically effect the quality of life rural residents currently enjoy. Who will police the traffic over our property? Fishing guides are generally nice guys, but they are always in a hurry to get their clients on to the water. Posted speed signs will NOT slow them down. We deal with this issue now. In fact many of the fishing guides are very defiant toward the home owner who's home they pass on every trip in and out.

Interestingly, I too am an avid fly fisherman. I bought my property to be close to the river. I often book trips with several of the local outfitters that have sent letters in support of this application. I understand their concerns regarding river access. Our objections will not be about limiting or further restricting access to the river. We are simply dealing with the issue of not providing "this" access which will significantly impact the rights and life style of the adjacent property owners.

Several of the outfitters that have signed letters in support of this access have indicated a financial impact this access might have on their business. I would challenge those claims. No outfitter will lose a client because they cannot access the river over my property. As I said, I am a fisherman but I am also a property owner.

If local outfitters feel they need additional access I am certain there is public land that could serve that purpose. Some of the letters of support indicate this is the only access point on the river below the diversion dam. That is just not true. There is an access point used by Worley Bugger Fly shop directly below the dam. Access to the river is over private property however, that access is controlled by Worley Bugger Fly shop. That access already exists. If the outfitters are so concerned with access below the dam I suggest they make that access point available to the other guides as well.

Mr. Carlson is proposing a campground on this property. Can you imagine the impact such a scheme will have on our property values and our way of life. The suggestion of a campground would be laughable if I didn't know better. How many cars and trucks will a campground account for? He never addressed that issue in his application. How does Mr. Carlson propose to deal with sewage, trash, potential fire danger and potential ground and water pollution horse manure and leaking cars and trucks will create. What kind of a campground does Mr. Carlson propose? Will this be something like the existing KOA campground? I suspect he proposes this be nothing more than a bunch of spaces cleared for tents and RV's with open fire pits? I can see those fire pits now...smoking embers with beer cans and bottles and other trash left for who ever gets around to cleaning up their mess. A port a potty...really? who cleans up the pollution when a bunch of drunk campers decide to "tip the potty?"

I wonder how the fire department is going to react to a campground? The road into the property is wide enough for one vehicle to pass at a time. A campground and horse stables will surely require a thorough environmental impact study. There is no shortage of existing campgrounds in the valley now. I don't want one in my back yard.

In addition, there is a small herd of deer that use this same area for bedding and grazing. I often see doe with their young grazing and bedding. You can be certain all this traffic and activity will certainly upset the wildlife.

Regarding the concerns for access indicated by the Kittitas Sheriff and Washington State Fish and Wildlife, I don't think any of the adjacent property owners would object to allowing unrestricted access to State Fish and Game officers or any other government or safety agency that may need to access the river via our properties. Our objection is to our neighbor operating a commercial business that requires accessing our properties and significantly impacts our quality of life. None of us became property owners expecting we would have to deal with such a proposal.

Mr. Watson, as I indicated above, I realize we will eventually have an opportunity to formally object to the proposed CUP however, I think it is important for your department to know early on that this application is going to meet with very strong opposition from the neighbors. Granting a CUP for the purposes outlined just makes no sense and is certainly going to negatively impact all of his neighbors. Additionally, I suspect this may spark a major legal challenge on the part of his neighbors.

I know you will give serious thought to issuing a CUP for the reasons requested. Is it fair any person(s) deserve to be so negatively impacted by a neighbor? Would you enjoy the disruption to your life caused by such an ill thought out and unnecessary proposal such as this. High traffic down your driveway at all hours, horse stables and a public campground?

The negative impact this will have on property values alone is worth denying such an unnecessary project.

I appreciate the time you have taken to read this note.

Kind regards,

Don Stoullil
property owner McManamy road.
206-295-7641