

From: Diann Dickey [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, July 05, 2012 11:11 AM
To: Wessel, Ann (ECY)
Subject: WIRA 18 Proposed Water Rule

Ann: The water rule that you and your staff have worked so hard on is headed for problems for your staff and for the property owners of WIRA 18.

- There are so many inconsistencies in the proposed application of the rule that I don't think it will possibly accomplish what your department has intended it to do, preserve water rights for future users.
- If this rule is enacted as it is presently drafted, your staff will probably be completely occupied with defending the DOE rather than assisting communities in managing the water sources.
- Class action lawsuits against DOE are likely to result from property owners who feel they are being unfairly restricted from the water rights they expected to continue to have when they bought their property.

There has got to be a better way to accomplish the preservation of water rights for future property owners and to allow existing property owners to have water to use for normal household and garden functions. Conservation of water has not been addressed in the analysis that your staff has represented in public meetings. When asked about the storage of water and conservation practices, your staff has said that was not an area that was researched in the development of the proposed rule.

Please go back to refining the scientific data used to develop this rule and give a fair and objective assessment of whether it is necessary to restrict water use in the Dungeness River Valley. Is there really a problem with instream water flow? Has the water flow actually diminished over the recorded history?

Diann Dickey
Managing Broker
John L. Scott, Sequim

