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

Sent: Thursday, July 09, 2009 8:52 PM
To: Wessel, Ann (ECY)
Subject: WRIA-17 Quilcene-Snow Watershed Proposed Rule

To: Ann Wessel, DOE

From: Ken Turner, Quilcene

Subject: Proposed Water Management Rule for WRIA-17, Comments On

I was unable to attend the sole meeting you held to take comments concerning the subject proposal, and would like to enter my comments into the records.

First, I have read the information published on your web site and in the local newspapers and unless I missed it, don't see how you arrived at the conclusion that these draconian measures are needed to insure sufficient stream flows to protect salmon, facilitate recreation, and the other items you listed on your web site. As a conservationist I am all for the wise use of our natural resources, but as an Engineer, I base my actions on scientific facts and so should you.

Questions: 1- Have you monitored the water levels of wells in the entire region affected by this rule over a long period (eg. 20 years), and if you have, does the data show that they have lowered? If you have not monitored well levels, then why not?

2- What scientific evidence do you have that deep drilled wells have an impact on these stream flows?

3- I dispute your figure of 350 gallons of water a day per household as being normal. I have read where you say it is for two people. What about a family of 5? What will they do? Are all the residential lots only going to be able to accomodate 2 people? By the way, a person who works for a PUD in an adjacent county says they figure 350 gallons per day per person. A rural acreage would probably need more due to the size.

4- In your information, you state there are so many existing residences in a drainage area and so many more that can be accomodated. Have you verified with county that there are in fact that many more lots already plotted and available to build on? Just looking at the Thorndyke drainage area, I have a hard tme visualizing the extra residences you say could be added. I could be wrong, but most of the area is in commercial timber. If there are not the number of vacant residential lots available, then the water allotment should be increased.

5- You say that meters will be required to monitor water useage and that you have no plans to charge for the water as you are not an agency that can do that. Fair enough, but what about all the other state and

county agencies that might see a way to get more money in their coffers? How can we be assured that homeowners will not be charged in the future?

6- I and others like me have vacant plotted lots for building residences on in the future, or for an investment . What this proposal will do is decrease the value of these lots. That is tantamount to "taking" of private property without compensation which violates the US Constitution. How do you plan to compensate these landowners for the decrease in their property value?

7- I read on your web site that an Environmental Impact Statement is not required. Who decided that an EIS was not required and why? I think one is required due to both impact on the environment and the finacial impact to the residents.

8- You went at length to describe the economic value of a salmon, but failed to describe the economic cost to the landowners, and the economic loss to the state and county caused by reduced land value. Why didn't you include all of he economic value changes?

It is apparent to me that much more thought needs to be put into this proposal before it becomes a rule. Please respond to my questions and provide me with the supporting scientific evidence.

Thank You, Ken Turner