

June 25, 2009

To: Washington State Department of Ecology  
P.O. Box 47775  
Olympia, WA 98504-7775  
Email: [awes461@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:awes461@ecy.wa.gov)

Reference: Cost Benefit Analysis ISFR for WRIA 17 dated: May 2009

Subject: In-stream Flow Rule, Public Comment

To whom it may concern,

The purpose of this memo is to provide a response to the DOE regarding the ISFR and the referenced Cost Benefit Analysis.

As a public Agency, the responsibility of DOE is to win the hearts and minds of the public by making wise decisions and defending them with sound facts and data. I've concluded that DOE has failed to accomplish this based on scientific evidence and omissions of important facts in the referenced cost benefit report. The DOE came to us nearly four years ago and agreed at that time to gather better facts and data (i.e. applicable scientific evidence) and to cooperatively work with the public to make this thing work. You failed to keep your word. It's hard to win the hearts and minds of the public by not keeping your word.

Things I personally have been looking for are:

**Proof of Conductivity:**

Show us scientific proof that by withdrawing water from a well in the Chimacum Valley that we are affecting the flow of a stream.

In my instance I live on a shoreline of Hood Canal where the flow of the aquifer flows from the Olympics to the east directly into the canal. How would restricting the use of water save a salmon?

**Cost Benefit Analysis:**

After reviewing the referenced analysis, I've concluded that it is flawed. I see that the cost of restricting outdoor use is applicable only to the Chimacum Vally and the 149 households predicted to be affected. I see nothing about the financial implications of this rule to anyone else in Jefferson County. I see nothing about the loss of market value of property because of water use restrictions nor do I see where predictions of lost income for those wishing to live in a sustainable environment and raise their own vegetables.

*Bud  
Schindler* \_\_\_\_\_

They must now purchase from outside the county, or the state and even outside the county.

This lack of consideration for all costs seems compounded by the over emphasis of costing the benefits. Page 19 mentions the preservation of 569 adult spawning fish using an estimated value 16 year value of \$5,000 per fish would cost \$2,845,000. For two fish one could purchase a car. This does nothing towards winning the hearts and minds of the public.

I suggest that this cost benefit analysis be recompiled by an unbiased entity using all applicable cost elements. Then show us the results.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Bud Schindler". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the typed name and address.

Bud Schindler  
270 Rhododendron Lane  
Brinnon, WA 98320