

July 2, 2012

Dept. of Ecology  
Bellingham Field Office  
Attn: Ann Wessel  
1440 10<sup>th</sup> Street #102  
Bellingham, WA 98225

**RECEIVED**

JUL 03 2012

DEPT OF ECOLOGY  
BELLINGHAM FIELD OFFICE

Re: Dungeness Watershed

Sent via: snail mail and fax (360) 715-5225

Dear Ms. Wessel,

We were once known to be "The land of the free and the home of the brave". The land still exists but the free are being destroyed in record numbers by out of control government agencies such as the Dept. of Ecology. We are still the home of the brave.

Under state law, the waters of Washington collectively belong to the public and cannot be owned by any one individual or group. What is the state law on air? If the Department of Ecology and the tribes are not claiming ownership of the water then how are they able to transfer the quantity of it for anyone's use and ask for mitigation? How do you sell something you don't own? If the water belongs to all of us collectively, then collectively we should be able to choose.

You state that a "water right" is a legal authorization to use a certain amount of public water for a designated purpose. What is an air right? Will government soon decide that it is best for everyone to stop all sport activities that raise our heartbeats to a certain level because we are consuming more than our share of oxygen ?

It's been said that the definition of insanity is to keep doing something in the same way over and over but expect to get different results. You have heard testimony on the negative results of WRIA 17 and yet the Dept. of Ecology proceeds in the same way over again with WRIA 18 and expects different results.

There are many knowledgeable people living within the Dungeness Watershed as well as many who have invested in property here. The Dept. of Ecology has not proven that the Dungeness Watershed is in jeopardy of having a lack of water to fulfill the needs of all the households that could be built in the area verses the water use that was traditional to the area farms. It has been proven locally that the farms used far more water in the past and that Salmon not only survived but thrived.

If the Dept. of Ecology is concerned about the Dungeness Watershed and conservation of our water resource drives the proposed changes then why haven't conservation actions been applied by educating the community?

Why hasn't anyone explored the use of household Grey Water Systems? Instead we are encouraged to develop sewer systems verses our water efficient septic systems because septic systems can fail and cause pollution. When a single septic system fails there is minor pollution, but when a public sewer system fails there is major pollution.

Why is it that the Dept. of Ecology and those it deems worthy will be able to have a "Water Banking System" while all of the people who already have wells on their property but have not been using the water for a household are being punished for their conservation instead of being granted a banked amount of water? Logic says that by creating a legal well they have already opened their bank account, have made deposits and withdrawals but are being penalized for letting their investment earn interest because they have not built on the property. Aren't these people a part of the collective public water? It seems that they should have a banked amount of water sitting in their accounts for their use. The wells are installed and I'm sure they were counted as drawing wells when your study was created.

What do you think will happen when meters are installed on wells supposedly to just monitor the amount of water that is being used? Here's what I think; people will use/waste incredible amounts of water to establish that they need that amount for their personal use. Even if those people normally use water carefully and conservatively, they would feel justified in being concerned that they be *allowed* enough water. Ask yourself what you would do if your neighbor said he was going to monitor your water use because he wants to sell what you're not using. Sell? I would say, you don't own the water it belongs to all of us collectively.

The idea of monitoring wells and mitigating water use is disturbing. It's disturbing because it's based on faulty science and an agenda that didn't include the collective who will be affected. It's disturbing because the infrastructure and access to the water is not being supplied by a public entity. If I lived in a city and water was maintained and delivered to my home through an infrastructure supplied by the city I would expect to pay for that service. Instead Ecology's expectation is that I will pay for the infrastructure and the maintenance of the water access so that Ecology and those deemed worthy can monitor and eventually charge for the use of the water. Where is the mitigation for my infrastructure? It's disturbing because there isn't science that says the ground water that is under my property comes from one of the rivers or goes back to one of the rivers that are subject to this rule. It is disturbing because I believe this is about government and those deemed worthy control; wrapped up as a gift to ourselves for our future.

In reality "We the people" are the endangered species. It's been said that what is right is right no matter who is against it. What is wrong is wrong no matter who is for it. What is legal is what politicians and lawyers decide more people are for than against.

Politicians often mistake or disregard what people are for or against and that can be changed by "We the people."



R. Doreen Emerson

