

From: Kathy Cooper [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, July 08, 2012 11:26 AM
To: Wessel, Ann (ECY)
Subject: Proposed Dungeness Water Rule comment

My name is Kathleen Cooper. I currently live at 62 Lazy Creek Lane in Sequim. Since 2004 I have owned a 5-acre parcel along Cassalery Creek, on Vine Maple Lane, zoned Ag, with the intention of building on it in a few more years. However I may choose to sell it instead, as I am happy with my current home.

I am deeply concerned about this proposed rule and the effect it will have on my future ability to obtain water rights for myself for reasonable cost, or to be able to sell the property w/o existing rights. The value of the property has already taken a huge hit since I bought it in 2004, and any further decrease in its value would be devastating to me financially. This proposed rule seems very unnecessary, arbitrary, and extremely unfair to those of us who have been holding our property until we retire or otherwise are ready to build on it. I purchased the property with the understanding that I would be able to pay to drill a well and then I would be all set for water. It seems the science on whether restricting future well use will have ANY effect on instream flows is highly questionable, and even if it did, there are many other ways of mitigating this problem than slamming those few of us who have parcels in the affected area that aren't using water yet. Why did they allow farmers to subdivide and sell all those parcels if there is not enough water? How about a tax on ALL water users, PUD included, so we future well-drillers don't have to bear all the weight of this iffy science? Why should someone who moves here from CA and buys a new ranchette not have to pay for his water, and I've lived here for years and have had my parcel for 10 years and have to pay for my water right? I understand there is the issue of State water rights law, which limits the options of dealing with this issue, but surely you can find other ways that are more fair and will be less of a financial hit to the community than this, especially since it is highly debatable whether the changes will have the desired effect. What if nobody wants to sell their water rights? And who would? Nobody! Look what happened in the Chimacum Valley - we don't want that here. If you want residents to use less water, then you have to make it more expensive for everyone, not just future users, even if it means putting meters on all existing wells.

Please discard this proposed rule and start over with something completely different, that doesn't place the burden entirely on so few unsuspecting citizens.