

Wyatt Greenawalt

In regards to the combined sewer overflow problem in Seattle as well as reported inadequacies of water transport and treatment within such systems state wide, I feel that the measure of funding should have its own dedicated public and scientific review to provide both focus and attention to these problems. Especially in highlighting and addressing future changes that will be necessary as the environmental changes come exponentially faster. As part of the Water Quality Management Plan to Control Nonpoint Sources of Pollution pages 72-75 it was noted that maintaining the quality of the 950,000 small on-site systems and the adequate management of water in all areas was incredibly important to many parts of Washington life. Furthermore, it was also noted in that document and in news publications that the water treatment system can be overwhelmed by unpredictable weather, requiring insurance and planning far past what would be considered necessary for normal weather.

Currently as Shoreline Management Act Rulemaking and planning for the State Fiscal Year 2026 Draft Water Quality Funding Offer List & Intended Use Plan continues, I believe there should be a high degree of caution, investigation, and consideration into how rising sea levels, and rapidly shifting weather will require rapid changes in infrastructure capability. Whether that be a separate space of further consideration in the 2026 final budget or an or another funding request geared specifically towards new and revitalized infrastructure to plan for flooding, sea level rise, and other major environmental effects addressed in the Shoreline management act.

Future proofing and insurance during shifting times will likely play a key role in protecting the environment and citizens of Washington in case of unexpected failure in water management infrastructure.