

>> From: Rachael Paschal Osborn rdpaschal@earthlink.net
>> Sent: Friday, June 26, 2009 4:56 PM
>> To: adun461@ecy.wa.gov
>> Subject: comments on Skagit plan

>> Dear Andy --

>> These comments are directed to the Skagit mitigation plan
>> protocols and draft plan for groundwater withdrawals from Hansen,
>> Carpenter/Fisher & Nookachamps subbasins. CELP has concerns and
>> questions. We believe these proposals are important both in terms of
>> the local watersheds and as a potential precedent for water
>> management elsewhere in the state.

>> Regarding the protocol, our primary concern is that there
>> is no opportunity for public input for non-specific water allocation
>> mitigation plans. Water is a state-owned and managed resource, and
>> people outside the Skagit watershed and not connected to the Flow
>> Management and/or Water Resources Advisory committees have interests
>> in Skagit water management and its impacts on growth, salmon habitat
>> and other related issues. As a statewide organization, we request
>> that you establish a protocol to allow for statewide dissemination of
>> information about mitigation proposals, perhaps via the web.

>> Regarding the draft mitigation plan we have several concerns.

>> (1) How do you know that the area where Skagit PUD is
>> delivering water is co-terminous with the area where new growth
>> dependent on the PUD water is occurring?

>> (2) It appears that this process allows for
>> double-dipping on the PUD's water right.

>> (3) How do guarantee that septic systems will be properly
>> maintained and there will not be degradation of water quality, which
>> must be a component of the mitigation equation? As we have learned
>> in the Spokane Aquifer, just because local regulations exist does not
>> mean they will be enforced. In fact, local governments are often
>> reluctant to enforce environmental regulations. What's the
>> contingency plan, including monitoring to ensure ground and surface
>> water quality is not degraded?

>> (4) How do you address the problem of false attraction
>> flows for salmon, particularly in the Nookachamps basin where we
>> understand there will be delivery of significant mainstem water
>> quantities -- enough to alter the chemistry of the stream?

>> (5) What legal arrangements are established to ensure
>> that the streams are obtaining the full benefit of the assumed
>> recharge? Is a recharge audit process in order? What are the
>> penalties if obligations are not met, particularly where permanent
>> housing growth has occurred?

>> (6) Likewise, how will the County be held accountable for
>> ensuring that requirements are met? As above, what are the
>> penalties?

>> (7) Why does Ecology think that 350 gallons per day is a
>> reliable figure for average household use? Why is 175 gpd in
>> recharge assumed? What is the scientific basis for these figures?
>> We understand that these figures are in the rule, but why?

>> (8) It seems like terrible policy to encourage growth
>> through a guaranteed water supply without requiring concomitant
>> provision of sewer service. Is this proposal consistent with state
>> GMA policies?

>> Thanks for considering our concerns. Please put CELP on
>> the mailing list for Skagit watershed matters. We look forward to
>> your responses.

>>

>> Yours very truly,

>> Rachael Paschal Osborn
>> Center for Environmental Law & Policy
>> 25 West Main, Suite 234
>> Spokane, WA 99201
>> 509-209-2899
>> www.celp.org