

From: David Kruth [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, July 05, 2012 12:09 PM
To: Wessel, Ann (ECY)
Subject: Wria 18 formal comment

This is a formal comment.

The largest city in your proposed WRIA 18 rule was supposed to have a vote at the Table. The revised basin excluded Port Angeles, so Sequim was the largest city. How come Sequim was not given a voting position in forming your rule? Doesn't this make your rule invalid since you didn't follow the legislative rule? Isn't this going to open up lots of court challenges and expenses to the State (taxpayers) because of law suits? You might consider adding to your Economic Benefit Analysis that you probably will keep all of the Peninsula lawyers fully employed for a long time fighting your rule. Can you rename this rule "The full employment act for Peninsula Water lawyers"? That may help the flawed Economic Benefit Analysis justify the expense.

David Kruth
[REDACTED]