

From: JG Thomas [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, July 09, 2012 6:26 AM
To: Wessel, Ann (ECY)
Subject: Water Resources Mgmt. Program - Dungeness (WRIA 18)

Dear Ms. Wessel -

We attended the open house and public hearing on June 28, 2012. Please accept this email as our objection to the proposed "rule" for the following reasons. In 2004 we purchased 8.12 acres off of Happy Valley Road in Sequim (County) with the intention of one day building our retirement home. Each successive year, we improved this acreage and completed a short plat. As part of the requirements of the County, we had to prove that there was water available. Each year after the purchase we made improvements, installed two wells, two pumps, provided road access improvements, underground electrical, telephone and lines for Highland Irrigation water and finally the septic system. You can appreciate that none of this is an inexpensive venture. Now, when we are at the threshold of finally building our home, we are facing an unknown financial impact that very possibly will prohibit the use of our property unless we pay a ransom in the form of mitigation (fees), face a loss not only of improvement costs but serious devaluation of our property.

Included in our Policy of Title Insurance are rights to water that have passed from one heir to the next and to ALL assigns thereafter. Having had no formal notification ever over the years, we continued with the development of the short plat, following all the rules - obtaining required permits, etc. With no inkling or fear concerning water, we proceeded.

After the open house and public hearing, we came away with certainty that this plan has not been realistically proven to be necessary. It has been proven that there is ample water in this area and that private water well usage has diminished consistently. In these economic times, it is virtually unbelievable that the Washington DOE will precipitate the loss of income to Clallam County (due to devaluation of property), to the individual property owners for the loss of use of their property and inhibit economic growth to peripheral businesses involved with property development.

Frankly, we don't understand why the DOE would further the downfall of the economy by imposing this unproven rule (theory).

Submitted by,

Jim & Geri Thomas
[REDACTED]