

Ron Buckholt

From: Ron Smith <smitty9729@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 21, 2022 5:15 PM
To: Ron Buckholt
Cc: Puneet Graver; cansul@comcast.net; dan@pinnacle-rarities.com; katonline@comcast.net; adamgraver@gmail.com; halldavid197@gmail.com; Hill55ra@gmail.com; Mary Jo Hurley; noreenjustinen@comcast.net; papasianc@umkc.edu; hearnkris@gmail.com; chuck9547@comcast.net; danwsandy@yahoo.com; martha@memoriesunlimited.com; Jim Brazil; Tonni Johnston; Sherry Reus
Subject: Project #2022103702 Johnson Point waterfront
Attachments: Shellfish project Thuurstons County.pdf

Mr Buckholt,

I left you a voice-mail Friday, 21 November 2022. You did not return my call.

Several people have voiced concerns over this proposed project and numerous questions have been asked. I am going to add to the growing list of unanswered questions.

The lack of communication to local residents within the broader affected zone has already been pointed out, as well as the difficulty in understanding where the proposed project area actually is.

As I look into the potential impact on our property, I would like to know:

The "meander line" is stated in our deed as the border of my property adjoining the Inlet. Where exactly does this fall relative to the proposed project?

Who is responsible for approving or disapproving this project, and under what authority? What is the actual process that is required of Taylor Industries to win approval?

Should this project, which I understand by hearsay is limited to a small portion of the 8.8 acre tract below our resident-owned tidelands, be approved, does this allow a fast-track approval of other portions of the parcel?

According to the statement in my property deed, the parcel in question was sold to an individual named Schneider in 1900, but is now owned by a resident of Colorado as stated in public records. According to the Bush Act of 1895 upon which the sale of this parcel by the State of Washington was based, ownership by a resident of Washington State is explicitly required. Has this law been revised to allow out-of-state ownership of these tidelands?

According to the Bush Act of 1895, sale of those tidelands was allowed for the explicit growing of oysters and only oysters. There is no mention of other clams. There is certainly no mention of geoduck. Why is this permit process being considered for anything other than oysters?

A copy of the Bush Act provision mentioned above is attached.

We who live in the Henderson Inlet watershed are proud to participate in a special, indeed, unique program that works toward restoring clean water to our inlet. Many of us grow oysters on our tidelands and view that as beneficial to water quality. I don't think the same can be said for geoduck farming. In what way will this project impact those efforts

towards improved water quality, either positively or negatively? Will Taylor Industries participate financially in any meaningful way towards those efforts?

Has there been any communication with the greater tax authority of Thurston County to consider the impact on property values on which county revenues are based? You relay a proposal that plans commercial shellfish growing adjacent to residential properties which are among the highest value in the county. Does it not raise the question of whether tax revenues from this shellfish operation may be paltry compared to lost taxes from reduced property values? Perhaps local real estate experts could voice an opinion as to the impact on property value of commercial shellfishing for export between our houses and Henderson inlet during low tide operations at 2am?

In short, there are more questions than answers raised here. Please help us by providing information. I believe that the comment period should be extended, the affected beach clearly delineated to any within reach of the full 8.8 acre tract, and that a public hearing should be held over this proposal.

Respectfully,
Ronald Smith and Deborah Hall
9119 Otis Beach St NE
Olympia, WA 98516
3602593789