

**From:** Nathan [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 05, 2012 12:37 PM  
**To:** Wessel, Ann (ECY)  
**Subject:** Instream flow rule, Sequim

Hi Ann,

I spoke with you about 3 years ago and the Dungeness Bridge meeting concern the proposed in stream flow rule. I had to step away due to frustration at the process and the reasoning behind it. However, I want to again voice my concern at the overreach of government on private property and the consequences it will have. I have been a real estate appraiser(not agent) for 20 years in Sequim so I do represent another industry that has a strong knowledge of the needs of home owners in my city. I am very familiar with the history of the valley and the importance of our wells with family dating back to 1870. The piping of the ditches will have long term affects to our wells and was ill-advised, however, this new rule will destroy the lives of the families that have lived in their homes expecting water in this valley as many have invested money in future parcels and more regulation will only tie their hands.

If public water was available I still would still disagree with government telling private property owners what they can and cannot do with their property. However, at least there would be an option.

The citizens of Sequim and I am sure other areas are not interested in your political agenda and do not agree with the science behind it. I asked that you would revisit your decisions for this flow rule in Clallam County. The net gain will be far less than the enormous cost to our community. These decisions need to be made by the stakeholders of our community and not Olympia.

I know you have heard all the data that we have supplied supporting our viewpoint so in order to keep this brief I am simply stating my opinion as you likely know my reasoning.

Thank you for your consideration.  
Nathan Funston