

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, July 05, 2012 7:56 AM
To: Wessel, Ann (ECY)
Subject: Planned Water Management/Dungeness Valley

----- Sirs:

I am greatly concerned over this plan and what the effects will be on my efforts to sell my primary residence, which is being served adequately by a well serving 3 households.

Sunday's July 4, 2012, Peninsula Daily News printed an article stating the Clallam County Commissioners wrote a letter addressing the state Ecology proposed water management rule for the Dungeness Valley....stating the letter was "available" at www.clallam.net it was not found by me, after a frustrating search of that site. So far, everything about this "rule" is lacking in disclosure, ie last Thursday community meeting in Sequim was produced with unbelievable poor quality audio/visual aids and badly narrated as to render it useless for the average person attending to gain any knowledge about this rule....but, I suppose the Ecology department got a box checked for making the presentation to the community, no matter the quality or effectiveness. It clearly was not intended to INFORM. I can't imagine private sector company making a presentation of this quality to "sell" a potential customer.

The following are questions I would like your departments response to:

1.0 Who made the determination that a need for this rule was necessary and....was it backed by concurring scientific analyses that would withstand "outside of Ecology" critical review ?
A) Who made the determination that the "remedy" fit the problem as a solution? With what scientific analyses? Was it computer based analysis?
B) What if any "pro/con" analysis was made about the proposed remedy, in view of the negative aspects on livability here in the Dungeness Valley this rule dictates. Are those data available for public review ?

1.0 What is Ecology's opinion of the effect of this proposed rule on my ability to sell my private residence, as follows:

- A) No effect
- B) Negative effect
- C) Positive effect

For any selection above, please offer your rationale for that selection

2.0 If the rule does what I believe it will do, ie severely limit my ability to use water from the well, which of the following is true:

- A) Clallam County Property Assessor will lower the assessed value of my property, if 1.0 (B) above was true
- B) Clallam County Property Assessor will raise the assessed value of my property, if 1.0(C) was true

3.0. There seems to be a study available now to determine the cost/benefit of this rule, which appears to show there is no benefit from a cost expenditure standpoint. Was the potential lost values of assessed property values part of the cost/benefits analysis?

- A) Who benefits from this rule?....in the face of a negative value from a cost/benefit analysis?....who's decision is it and with what authority?
- B) Why is rule limited to the Dungeness Valley water system?

Respectfully,
Charles Blood