

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 28, 2012 11:59 AM  
**To:** Wessel, Ann (ECY); [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Costs of the Water Rule to the Community

Dear Ann, Margarite etc.

I wanted to reiterate Margarite's comments and in addition add a few of my own.

I was Fisheries director for the Summit Lake Paiute tribe in NV, and was responsible for Lahonton Cutthroat trout management. I also assisted in the planning development of housing in ecologically sensitive environment.

I am surprised by the high and unattainable level of river flow being used as the standard. The whole idea is to protect fish populations and retain the ability to provide water for multiple other uses. Most of the decline in fish populations seems directly attributable to ocean catch and influences other than freshwater habitat. Given the history of the fish population in the river at historic flows, and even greater historic irrigation use, it seems illogical to assume that greater water flow will do anything to increase or sustain the fisheries. Lastly given the amount of irrigation water reductions that you and the irrigators have been able to effect, (thank you), it seems that the mitigation of buildout is inconsequential, and the costs are not justifiable.

In the light of when you intend to apply the rule without first having an mitigation process currently available, it you are showing no regard for the existing community, including those who intend to build in the future.

PLEASE do not make the rule law until AFTER the water bank or some other entity is available to make getting a building permit possible. If not all future development is halted and dependant on the whim of the people who have water to sell.

Also, please allow individuals to purchase mitigation water for existing parcels, in the absence of building permit, you could tie the water mitigation to a specific parcel of land. That way people who own land can reasonably expect to be able to use it, and people who want to subdivide and could purchase mitigation water and protect the properties ability to be developed in the future.

By tying the ability to purchase mitigation to a building permit you are discouraging retention of undeveloped land, reducing values, increasing the urgency to develop by creating a fear that water will not be available later. While the lack of water may be an inevitable future, why cause so much stress, and loss of property values when it is easily avoided.

The least expensive and best management practice, would be to include in the rule a mechanism for the state to fund the purchase of mitigation water and a pass through fee for the end users of the water. It is the department of ecologies responsibility to monitor the river, and transfer water rights, giving that power over to the water bank or making them the only facilitator makes them a private utility. The Public Utility district #1 of Clallam county, (PUD) is a public utility with transparent and public records. They have a long history of protecting the environment and the community, and are part of our community. You could easily

enter into a agreement with PUD, train thier employees on how the effect the transfer of water and they already do water metering. Again, why recreate what we already have in a utility company?

Lastly while ecology has stated that it is not thier intention to have all wells metered and pay for mitigation, your rule obviously states otherwise.

Thank you for protecting the environment on our behalf and working with us in this endeavor

Sincerley  
Scott Gordon [REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Date:** 6/27/2012 3:54:54 PM  
**To:** [awes461@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:awes461@ecy.wa.gov)  
**Subject:** Formal Comment for the Dungeness Water Management Rule

The Cost-Benefit Analysis for WRIA 18 East was done very quickly, by two new economists. The Benefits of this proposed Rule most certainly do not outweigh the Costs. We do not know if there would have been a lawsuit from the Tribe or anyone else, without the Rule. The percentage given for the "possibility of a lawsuit" was 14.1 to 27.7--less than a one-third chance.

The Cost of this Rule is estimated at \$7.7 million to \$23.1 million, over 20 years. Not taken into consideration was the devaluing of property. All real estate agents know that water is incredibly important in marketing a piece of property. Currently, anyone with an exempt well has the ability to

- \*\* Use up to 5,000 gallons per day for their own domestic use, and
- \*\* Water up to 1/2 acre of lawn or garden, and
- \*\* Provide stock water in unlimited quantities, and
- \*\* Use up to 5,000 gallons per day for commercial or industrial uses.

While all of these uses are very valuable, I don't really think the last one was given much thought, in the CBA. We are a rural area. Most of us have a garden, or tomatoes, or berries, or flowers. Many of us buy fruits or vegetables or flowers from farm stands, and farmers' markets. The ability to have greenhouses on your property, to provide produce for Sunny Farms, or restaurants, farm stands, street fairs, etc., is huge. The ability to water orchards, to sell fruit, from your own farm stand, or otherwise, is huge. The ability to water beautiful plants and flowers, and sell them, is huge. You can water a small nursery, with water from your exempt well. Without the Rule, this can be done. And, without the Rule, someone with a well, who wanted to expand to that use, could do also do it.

Also very valuable is garden/home orchard/berry watering part of the exemption. People enjoy their own produce, without pesticides. A garden is part of our rural lifestyle. And, the stockwatering portion of the exemption is also very valuable. Many of us buy local, organic beef, from farmers, or from Sunny Farms. We eat it, at local restaurants. We eat our own eggs from chickens, or buy eggs from farm stands. Some people raise rabbits or chickens or sheep or cows, for their own food. Without the ability to stock water, that choice is gone.

In the future, if this Rule passes, as proposed, real estate agents will be asked which properties have the ability to water outside. Which properties have the ability to have greenhouses. Which ones will be able to have, and water, an orchard. Those properties that do not have these grandfathered features, will most definitely go down in value. They will have to ask far less, for their property, than what they could today. Most certainly, they will ask the County Assessor for relief from their taxes. And, as their taxes are reduced, other taxes must go up. Grandfathered water properties will increase in value.

How much water could we buy, with the Cost of this Rule? A LOT. How many restoration or storage projects could we undertake? Quite a few.

The Benefits absolutely do not outweigh the Costs.

Sincerely,

Marguerite A Glover

