

Ron Young

Having completed over 20 short plats in WC, and dealt with many wells being drilled, and having been involved with, and followed the well situation all through the Hurst hearings, and being a civil engineer for over 50 years now, and trying to apply the practical common sense to this decision the following points stand out as important concerns:

- 1) the overall perspective is out of context in that the critics most often focus on the 5,000 gpd allowance figure charged against each well. This is thousand of gallons above the truth.
- 2) there has not been any "real" evaluation of the water usage by residential well users that confirm excessive use and water ecology damage relative to the volume of water used (lately estimated between .5 and 1.5% of the total daily use across the county cities.
- 3) Conservation strategies should apply to the cities also as they dominate water usage and groundwater removal actions.
- 4) Science has confirmed a majority of all water taken from a well returns to the ground water (92-94%).
- 5) Studies were to be done that demonstrated the detriment to groundwater/aquifer storage/ aquifer water transportation impacts to drainage basins, shoreline fisheries, etc. To date this has not been done conscientiously, that I have heard of.
- 6) Biggest of all is the issue of "politics" being played over the water issues. Many complaints are based on political agendas, political parties vying for votes, and basic disregard for what is a truthful and caring approach to the overall problem...or if there is truly a problem. **THE FACTS THAT THIS HAS BEEN A TOP TOPIC OF CONVERSATION BY SO MANY ORGANIZATIONS AND GOVERNMENT GROUPS, UNDER PRESSURE OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON TO COME UP WITH A SOLUTION, SAYS THE SUBJECT TRUTHS ARE NOT KNOWN TO THIS DATE. IF ALL THE FACTS ARE PRESENTED LOGICALLY, FAIRLY AND ACCURATELY, THE MAJORITY OF THE AREA RESIDENTS WOULD RESOLVE A COMMON SOLUTION. WHEN IT IS BEING FORCED ON THE PEOPLE, MOST TIMES IT IS NOT THE RIGHT ANSWER.**