

From: Richard Kott [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, July 09, 2012 4:54 PM
To: Wessel, Ann (ECY)
Subject: WRIA 18 In Stream Water Flows for Dungeness Area

Dear Ms. Wessel:

The proposed instream flows for the Dungeness River which includes Bagley Creek and Siebert Creek is not based upon peer reviewed sound science. The proposed rules should be held in abeyance until such studies are performed and adequately presented to the public and affected property owners in appropriate meetings. The public meetings to date have not presented proof that such studies have been made resulting in clear and unequivocal evidence that instream flows are necessary for fish protection. This in turn has led to proposed well restrictions and the potential of a water bank controlled by a company or other authority not responsible to local officials.

An example of the shallow scientific analysis is including both Bagley and Siebert creeks in WRIA 18. There is no evidence that they are connected to the Dungeness system. I have written to you earlier about this during WRIA 18 hearings and you summarily dismissed my concerns by saying they are hydrologically connected but with no proof. Other streams with unique qualities have also have been similarly impacted. If you proceed with the rulemaking for the Dungeness you should exclude these watersheds with special characteristics.

It is shameful that DOE is planning to implement instream flow rules and water rights restrictions for us local residents under the sham of it being good science. If you proceed call it what it is, a political solution to a perceived problem. The economic consequences will be devastating to our economy. As chairman of the board of a local bank I regularly see the results of the economic impact of the uncertainty created by the proposed rules. Businesses, home owners and property owners waiting to build their dream homes are all affected.

I urge you to place on hold the rule making process until a satisfactory peer reviewed scientific analysis is performed. This should be coupled with an economic cost benefit analysis. Furthermore to ease the burden of economic stagnation on residents DOE should implement a temporary plan that allows new construction to move forward without future consequences until the new rules are implemented.

Sincerely,

Richard G. Kott