

# Wynne Lee

1 Prioritize water conservation. Save first to reduce waste. The rule and supporting document provide little information about water conservation. Please provide information on how much water existing rural residents and businesses could save with rebates for efficient water fixtures (toilets, dishwashers, washing machines). Water conservation can meet the 1 CFS requirement over the next 20 years.

2 Please give the cost per quantity of water saved for each project. In the supporting document, please include the cost per acre-foot of water offset each year (\$/AFY). Knowing the cost per quantity of water offset will be important for decision-makers to judge which projects do the greatest good for the lowest cost to taxpayers.

3. Please don't subsidize rural development above agriculture water projects. Especially in Whatcom County where I live, we need to support agriculture strongly. The SRA was written to address the impacts of new rural development using exempt wells. Any improvements in irrigation efficiencies and other agricultural water projects should provide water rights for farmers who lack sufficient legal water rights and improve streamflows. Please remove Projects 2 and 26 from consideration.

4. Please remove expensive, unpredictable projects requiring many permits. Projects 8, 24, and 28 won't be needed if water conservation is prioritized and implemented over the next few years. Please remove those 3 projects.

5. Please remove the new section on exemptions. WAC 173-501-074 opens up interruptible rights for Projects 2, 8, 26, and 28. This won't be needed if water conservation is implemented.

Address climate change impact on projects. 6. Please add information on what effect climate change will have on all of the projects. We KNOW that WA glaciers are retreating, that snowpacks are likely to decrease, and that overall temperatures are and will continue to increase.

7. Add re-forestation and other elements to increase water retention and decrease run-off.

8. Reduce allowed well water demand. I strongly approve (as a rural property owner with exempt well!) reducing domestic withdrawal limits to 500 gallons per day (this is down from 3,000 gallons per day annual average), 3000 gal/per or less for outdoor use. As exempt well owner now with a large garden, I assure you the proposed lower limits are VERY generous with well-designed, efficient watering systems! No way these modestly lower limits will 'wreck rural lifestyles!'. This should be done for both existing and new exempt wells, so everyone is treated equally.

To make the change less burdensome to existing well owners, give them a reasonable transition period (3-5 yrs) to make and objectively demonstrate (ie meter) they are meeting the new standards. I'll bet many already are operating at these lower levels.

9. Require metering, not just for new but also for current exempt wells. Measurement is \*essential\* for successful, prudent management of water, just as measurement is an absolutely essential part of businesses, medicine, agriculture, fishery management, construction, private and public budgets, etc.

Frankly, it's just plain dumb IMO to pretend that sound measurement is NOT needed for successful water management, in our times of increasing population and severe, documented environmental challenges. Not measuring may politically 'please' those looking for short term benefits, but ensuring long-term availability of fresh water must be the SOLE purpose of revised water use rules.