

Response to Comments on Citizen's Draft Vashon-Maury Island Watershed Plan

WRIA 15 recognized the Vashon-Maury Island Ground Water Protection Committee (GWPC) as a citizen caucus representing island during watershed planning. The GWPC formed a planning subcommittee at its June 23, 2004 meeting. Subcommittee meetings were open to the public as it met over seven months in 2004 and 2005 to develop a citizen's draft Vashon-Maury Island Watershed Plan. After the Plan was drafted, public comment was received in two public meetings and in response to articles and an insert in local newspapers.

Please note that sections of the citizen's draft Plan were renumbered in the final version of the Plan; the responses to comments below refer to the section numbers of the final Plan.

Comment Topics	Vashon Watershed Plan Subcommittee Response	Commentor(s) (see list of commentors at end of document)
<p>Development Moratorium</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support general concept or strongly in favor of moratorium on new construction at any time ground water quality and natural surface flows appear to be in jeopardy. • In the event of a water quality or quantity crisis, Vashon community could be called to vote on building moratorium. • Moratorium language needs to be explicit. • If new information indicates an inability to meet water demand on a sustainable basis, the county should apply a complete moratorium on sale of new water rights and new private well permits. • Contingency plans with local control over moratorium should be developed. • Support moratorium with modifications: 1) tie to water supply/quality, 2) reject complete moratorium, direct action to occur in specific areas, and 3) indicate what model, data or information will be used to determine if a moratorium should be implemented, and if so for how long. 	<p>Language in Section 4 of the draft Plan regarding a possible moratorium has been removed. King County Comprehensive Plan Policy R-107 was developed to address concerns raised during the community planning process in the 1980's about the need to take actions to protect water supply if water quality or quantity began to decline. This policy was removed in the 1996 review of the Comprehensive Plan, and replaced with CP-1227, which provides more flexibility in responding to a decline in water quality or quantity. The committee was not aware that Policy R-107 had been replaced until after it had circulated the citizen's draft Plan.</p>	<p>9, 14, 18, 23, 25, 27, 29, 32</p>
<p>Conservation and Preventing Contamination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly support the principle to sustainably manage water resource, recognize interconnection of surface and ground waters. • Develop planning approach that prevents pollution and 	<p>Sections 4 and 5.2 of the final Plan contain additional text describing the monitoring program, the King County Water Resource Evaluation, and how sustainability applies to water quality. A new section on governance and implementation (Section 5.10) includes recommendations for annual actions to</p>	<p>9, 25</p>

Comment Topics	Vashon Watershed Plan Subcommittee Response	Commentor(s) (see list of commentors at end of document)
<p>scarcity problems, rather than one which responds to an emerging crisis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Better define how sustainable applies to water quality concerns. 	<p>prevent groundwater contamination. Recommendation #3 in Section 5.10 also commits the Groundwater Protection Committee to work with county and state agencies to define sustainability criteria to use in implementing this Plan.</p>	
<p>Conservation and Gray Water Use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gray water plan needs to be an integral part of our long term community water plan. Gray water systems particularly appropriate for new construction. Water Barrel/Storage Systems have evolved quite a bit. For every inch of rain that falls on (roughly) 1500 square feet of roof, 800 gallons of water are recovered. This Plan should recommend that King County pursue legal provisions for alternative water catchments, storage and use. Rain water could be on a backward meter like electricity to create incentive for its collection and storage. 	<p>Recommendation #5 under Water Use and Conservation includes use of gray water, water retention, and rain water harvesting. Recommendation #6 also seeks funding and incentives for appropriate gray and reclaimed water use.</p>	7, 10, 18, 24
<p>Education</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan needs more recommendations for outreach and education. Education should include: the importance of household hazardous waste disposal, use of lawn fertilizers, pesticides, alternative products, septic systems. We need a continuing education effort to quantify the state of our available public and private water supplies, and monitor their quality. 	<p>Recommendations #5 and #7 under Water Use and Conservation; #5 under Exempt Wells; #6 under Fuel Storage Tanks; #4 under Septic Systems; and #1 under Pesticide, Fertilizer and Herbicide Use reflect the need for continuing outreach and education.</p>	3, 12, 17, 23
<p>Exempt Wells</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly encourage more data collection on a range of contaminants - both in streams and in groundwater. We must find the money to do it, either from SWM fees or some other sources. 	<p>A portion of the SWM fees is currently used to fund a monitoring program that has been developed by the Groundwater Protection Committee and the county. Text in Section 4 has been added to describe these efforts.</p>	16
<p>Fuel Storage Tanks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide costs for double wall tanks, above ground tanks and tank removals if recommended in the Plan. Plan should include filling of old fuel tanks instead of exhuming. If exhume in accordance with state and federal law it is very expensive. Cleaning and filling is not 	<p>The section of the draft Plan on Underground Fuel Storage Tanks has been changed to a new Section 5.6 on Fuel Storage Tanks. This more accurately reflects the desired outcome that no new or existing residential fuel storage tanks contaminate groundwater, regardless of whether they are below or above ground. Recommendation #3 of Section 5.6</p>	1, 22, 33

Comment Topics	Vashon Watershed Plan Subcommittee Response	Commentor(s) (see list of commentors at end of document)
<p>expensive and is allowed by state and county authority.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Help pay for tank cleaning and filling (vs. exhuming) by making grant money available. 	<p>suggests filling unused underground fuel storage tanks that are old or failing. Recommendations #4 and #5 focus on funding sources to provide incentives for the elimination of old or failing tanks and increasing participation in the oil tank program of the State of Washington Pollution Liability Insurance Agency.</p>	
<p>Funding and Incentives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add wording to allow alternative with incentive funding (similar to energy audits and cash rebates.) • Seek to secure tax benefit for personal conservation efforts. • Make sure there are incentives for good stewardship and funding for increased research public education incorporated into this Plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation #7 under Water Use and Conservation seeks the development and funding of an island conservation program, and the consideration of incentives for conservation. • Incentives are also sought in Recommendations #9 under Water Use and Conservation, #7 under Exempt Wells, #4 under Fuel Storage Tanks, #6 under Septic Systems, and #2 under Stormwater Management. 	<p>4, 18, 23</p>
<p>General Plan Content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend requirement to compile accurate data on stream, well monitoring for both quantity and quality. Thank you for planning proactively vs. having island respond to crisis later. • Consider building a pipe to supply water to the island. • The implications of a continuing trend of rising nitrate levels and other water quality measures need to be further fleshed out in the Plan, so it is clear what is at stake and what actions need to be taken. A proactive approach is recommended in the Plan, but a fundamental principle of non-degradation is lacking. A clear principle of non-degradation of water quality needs to be added, with an early warning system to trigger specific actions to address signs of declining water quality. • Firmly request that local government take whatever action is necessary to prevent any further contamination of the ground water resources of this island. • Add a section on dispute resolution and some local governance (i.e., a local council of elders). • Retain right of veto within the Vashon Community for any water policies / contingency plan (in case of water shortage) proposed by King Co. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Text in Section 4 of the Plan has been added to describe the 7-year monitoring program that is currently underway. As part of this program, data is being compiled on both ground and surface water. • Building a pipe to provide water to the islands was not considered in this Plan, but could be considered as part of a future planning effort. • Additional text has been added to Section 3.2 and throughout the final Plan to describe water quality concerns. Recommendation #1 under Septic Systems specifically addresses nitrates. • A non-degradation policy is included in the 1998 Groundwater Plan and in the principles, listed in Section 2.1, that guided the development of this Plan. These principles will also guide the work when (Recommendation #3 under Governance and Implementation) the VMI Groundwater Protection Committee works with the County to define sustainability criteria to use in implementing the Watershed Plan. • A new Section 5.10 has been added to define implementation tasks and ensure ongoing evaluation and adaptive management of our water resources. • The focus of the Plan is to insure that islanders are at the 	<p>3, 4, 8, 9, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 25, 26, 28, 30, 32</p>

Comment Topics	Vashon Watershed Plan Subcommittee Response	Commentor(s) (see list of commentors at end of document)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We need a modicum of regulation to insure a base level of good management. Your Plan, as currently proposed, would give King County unlimited license to confiscate property on Vashon. Plan could be written and organized better to reflect the planning process and indicate how the desired outcomes can be achieved. Support Plan. 	<p>table, working with County and State agencies to ensure the protection of our water resources. The Groundwater Protection Committee has significantly affected the objectives and design of the monitoring program currently underway, and is committed to continuing its influence on the county's work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Neither the draft nor final Plan gives the County license to confiscate property. Section 3 describes the planning process, and Section 5.10 describes recommendations on governance and implementation. 	
<p>Pesticides / Fertilizers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why isn't water quality addressed? Please include recommendations for pesticides, hazardous materials and fertilizers. The Plan should recommend placing big red signs at places where damaging pesticides and fertilizers are sold. The Plan should suggest alternatives to commonly used damaging pesticides and fertilizers. Education as to how damaging fertilizers, hazardous waste and pesticides can be to water quality should be included. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Text has been added to Section 3.2 to better describe water quality issues. Additional text in Section 5 also indicates those recommendations that relate to water quality. Section 5.9 describes and makes recommendations on these water quality concerns. The Executive Summary lists priority action items. The first of these is the development of an island-wide education program that will include water quality issues. 	3, 12, 17, 26, 32
<p>Principles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly support the principles that have guided groundwater planning on Vashon in the past -- sustainable management of the resource. Principles section is good and thoughtful. Take very seriously the principle that we, the current generation, have a trust responsibility to preserve our water resources for posterity (human and other!) Support the principle of being proactive, rather than reactive. Recommend incorporating other principles that convey every water users' responsibility to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1)ensure a clean and sustainable water supply for posterity, 2)treat water as a community resource, and 3)take actions to prevent contamination and overuse that 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A principle that identifies water as a common property resource has been added to the Plan. The principles will guide the work when (Recommendation #3 under Governance and Implementation) the VMI Groundwater Protection Committee works with the County to define sustainability criteria to use in implementing the Watershed Plan. A principle on self-sufficiency is included in the 1998 Groundwater Plan. While it is not explicitly stated in this Watershed Plan, the commitment to sustainable use of our water resources and preservation of natural hydrology imply self-sufficiency. This also underlies the design and purpose of the monitoring plan and the Water Resource Evaluation. 	3, 9, 14, 17, 26

Comment Topics	Vashon Watershed Plan Subcommittee Response	Commentor(s) (see list of commentors at end of document)
<p>would be detrimental to existing users.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One of the most critical principles the Plan needs to embody is island self-sufficiency of water supply and quality. 		
<p>Septic Systems</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include more comprehensive recommendations for outreach and education around septic systems. Funding for more septic inspection, monitoring and enforcement should be included. Add a requirement for verification of septic tank and drain field for each residence outside of regulated sewer districts. What can be done to correct leaking sewers? Recommend that Seattle King County Public Health come up with more proactive and alternative approaches to septic problems. Use Vashon as test case for new approaches. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendation #4 under Septic Systems, one of the Priority Action Items listed in the Executive summary proposes to continue and expand existing education programs on septic system maintenance and failure. Existing County regulations provide oversight of new systems. Recommendation # 3 under Septic Systems addresses the possibility of the formation of an organization to manage septic issues locally for the island, including inspection of systems. The Groundwater Committee will address this issue later this year to identify options to correct leakage that may be occurring. Recommendation #2 under Septic Systems has been added, and is identified as one of the Priority Action Items in the Executive Summary. 	<p>2, 3, 12, 18, 24, 32</p>
<p>Stormwater</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider using bentonite/diatamatus earth is a naturally-occurring substance, a type of clay, to prevent water-storage ponds from seeping. Over the next ten years, it should be a goal of King County to integrate the use of pervious material for road construction and repair. Look at stormwater runoff from roads see if it is contributing to stream erosion and/or contamination in some instances (Triple Brook up near Agren; Judd along Cemetery Rd; Shinglemill near Airport covered bridge on Cove Rd) - Are there ways to slow and/or filter such water? Can ditches curve? (2) Can landowners receive incentives for participating in solutions? Watch language closely. Say rain, when you mean rain. What is stormwater? Natural drainage systems are a natural for unincorporated, non urban King County. King County should do more in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This Plan does not recommend the use of specific materials, but focuses on broader objectives listed under “Desired Outcomes” in each subsection of Section 5. The Groundwater Protection Committee will be monitoring implementation of the stormwater recommendations, and will have continuing briefings on stormwater issues and changes to the County’s Surface Water Design Manual. This Plan does not review stormwater runoff issues on specific streams, but intends to put in place LID projects that will slow and filter stormwater runoff, no matter where it occurs on the island. Recommendation #2 seeks to provide incentives to those property owners who install stormwater flow control measures in excess of County requirements. Stormwater is defined in the glossary, Appendix B of the Watershed Plan. Recommendations #1 and #3 under Stormwater Management, address King County road construction and 	<p>3, 10, 16, 19, 24</p>

Comment Topics	Vashon Watershed Plan Subcommittee Response	Commentor(s) (see list of commentors at end of document)
<p>this field of storm water management. The grading and clearing, relevant building and drainage codes need to be changed to allow these strategies, and the developers given incentives to use them. King County Roads Division should be required to use natural drainage techniques in the construction and repair of roads and build roads to minimum widths.</p>	<p>maintenance.</p>	
<p>Surface/Groundwater Interaction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support increased monitoring of the quality and quantity of our creeks and ground waters from SWM fees or some other source. • Monitor and review our water situation with the goal of maintaining the natural water flow between surface and ground water. • Consider in stream flows in Judd Creek important for surrounding landscape. • Special attention should be given to saltwater intrusion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under coordination with the Groundwater Committee, the County currently uses a portion of island SWM fees to fund our 7-year monitoring program. • Monitoring is a goal of our 7-year monitoring program and the Water Resource Evaluation. Both are described in text that has been added to Section 4. • The second principle that guided development of this Watershed Plan states a commitment to preserve natural hydrologic function. • Saltwater intrusion is one of the water quality concerns stated in the Plan. This is being monitored under the 7-year monitoring program. 	<p>8, 9, 16, 17, 18, 25</p>
<p>Water Rights</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If new information indicates an inability to meet water demand on a sustainable basis, the county should apply a complete moratorium on sale of new water rights and new private well permits. Water rights granted before the date of moratorium shall be honored with water availability letters for the purpose of obtaining building permits while King County updates the Vashon Community Plan and area zoning and a sufficient cost effective, and sustainable water supply is identified to meet projected demand. 	<p>The language in the draft Plan regarding moratoriums has been removed. It had been included in King County Comprehensive Plan Policy R-107, which no longer exists. R-107 had been developed to address concerns raised during the community planning process in the 1980's about the need to take actions to protect water supply if water quality or quantity began to decline. This policy was removed in the 1996 review of the Comprehensive Plan, and replaced with CP-1227, which provides more flexibility in responding to a decline in water quality or quantity. The committee was not aware that Policy R-107 had been replaced until after it had circulated the draft Plan.</p>	<p>27</p>

Comments Received After the Deadline

Commentor(s)
(see list of
commentors at end
of document)

- Comment from March Twisdale:
 She regarded the poison-free headline as exaggerated and inflammatory (and she describes herself as an environmentalist)

.
 She would like us to do more to create buy-in from the Vashon community on our Plan.
 She put in an aside about the provisions of the CAO that levy a fee for blackberry clearing - as dumb as it gets.
 She would like the responsibility to pay for the provisions of the Plan placed on the participating governments, not property owners (that ought to satisfy Jay's predilection for alliteration).
 She advocates for rainwater harvesting.
 She encourages incentives/benefits for gray water use in new homes or retrofit.
 She advocates for water retention ponds in appropriate locations.
 She suggests we add above-ground oil storage tanks to the list of alternatives to USTs.
 She strongly believes that we should include affordability (to property owners) caveats in our desired outcomes (e.g., USTs).
 She supports using SWM fees to eliminate USTs and fix failing septics, but she'd like a firm commitment and direct grants to homeowners.
 She supports the LID in stormwater section.
- Comment from Cathy de Smet:
 Hello, I am writing this to serve as my public comment on the Vashon-Maury Island Watershed Plan. Overall, I am in favor of the Plan moving forward and getting approval of this first phase in order to qualify for funding that becomes available after 6/2/05.
 What I think is needed, and I would like to see this be part of the funding use, are studies to get complete information on current water use on Vashon-Maury Island as well as an island wide assessment of conservation potential. It seems that those are part of your recommendations.
 I would like to see specific water quantity or quality triggers written into the Plan, such as maximum nitrate level in x percentage of wells or public water supply, that would indicate when a mandated change is necessary. These triggers need to be before a crisis in water quality or quantity situation is reached. These specifics may come in phase 2(after June 2), however stating in this document what measurable elements will be looked at as triggers would be helpful. It would support the statement in the revision of CP-1227 If new information indicates the groundwater supply is projected to be used beyond its sustainable capacity... and help it to be less vague.
 I believe that controlling or stopping new development in order to protect water quality and quantity needs to be balanced with conservation strategies island wide. Someone could build a new home that is much more water efficient and returns more water to the groundwater supply than older homes or other land use on Vashon.
 In the direction of new building or remodeling, I would like to see specific language in our Watershed Plan that addresses our desire as a community to have alternative systems, such as to manage gray water separately from septic or varieties of composting toilet systems. I would like to see it become an easier process and more accepted method of managing waste here by King County and the State Department of Health.
 I agree with the recommendations in the Plan to find funding sources that support changes by property owners to fix septic

5, 6, 11, 31, 34

Comments Received After the Deadline

Commentor(s)
(see list of
commentors at end
of document)

systems, underground fuel tanks, etc. I think that some of the alternative septic or gray water systems would also benefit from a funding program, possibly as a way to get more island homes involved and assess the benefits. I agree with the recommendations of section 4.7 Septic, and want there to be a way to control cost of the first 4 recommendations in order to facilitate compliance and allow the working class person to still afford to own a home here. Thank you for all your work so far. I very much appreciate it!

- **Comment from Dennis Williams:**

Per your suggestion I am emailing you comments on the proposed Vashon Plan. My family has been on Vashon for five generations and have been the primary fuel dealer on the Island since 1929.

1) Any plan to control/regulate water usage should contain measures to meter and monitor private wells.

2) I believe that the most effective and important message to communicate to the public regarding underground fuel tanks is to promote registration of the tanks with PLIA. PLIA (Pollution Liability Insurance Agency) is a state managed program that provides insurance for residential storage tanks. It is paid for by a tax on fuel dealers and is available at no cost to the home owner. Unused abandoned fuel tanks should be decommissioned as per current regulations. In use tanks have indicators when going bad (water seeping into the tank, excessive consumption), that abandoned tanks to not. Updating of old tanks should be encouraged. The current King County fee structure for a tank permit is onerous and should be changed. The permit costs almost as much as the tank! I do not believe that it is appropriate for the Plan to encourage individuals to switch fuel sources. The alternatives fuel sources of propane and electricity are more expensive than oil, and wood heat has a detrimental effect on our air quality. Natural gas is not available to many parts of the Island. The costs associated with a system and fuel changeover are extreme, and it is more appropriate to conserve through better insulation, updated equipment, and temperature setback than to change fuel.

3) I believe that the number of underground fuel tanks on the Island is overstated in the proposed Plan. I estimate that the number of active tanks is about half of your estimate. I do not believe there are as many abandoned tanks as active ones.

4) The cost of decommissioning a tank using the fill in place method is about one half of the costs shown in your presentation.

5) Your presentation materials had a map of titled leaking commercial underground storage tanks on Vashon. I believe that the map and location information was not accurate. I think that it was actually showing locations that had registered tanks at one time, not necessarily active and/or leaking ones.

In conclusion I would like to support the monitoring of our ground water without the additional regulations. I believe existing laws and regulations properly enforced are adequate.

Comments Received After the Deadline

Commentor(s)
(see list of
commentors at end
of document)

- **Comment from Greg Beardsley:**
I have been looking at the website and was wondering if there was a contact to comment on the current draft Plan. I have been to several of the meetings but spent my time listening to the varied QA and statements.
I tried to get the map up but it seems to not want to load. The one I did get seemed to not show my well, or mislocated it to the north considerably. The map in the Plan that shows the water utilities seems to indicate that Westside comes down into my area. The last I heard they has rescinded that territory. Though I would prefer dealing with them rather than Island Spring.
After reading the Plan I see one major issue that has not been covered. That issue is the wholesale sticking of holes into the ground for water by individual well owners. It would seem to me that the policy of the County and State should be to encourage the development of public systems rather than unregulated individual ones. The State does not seem to do that with the heavy restrictions on water rights and other rules. With almost half of the island not covered by regulated systems there seems to be a bit of a blind eye being turned.
- **Comment from Dick Bianchi:**
I am writing you to try and get more information as a result of the meeting that was held last week. I am also copying Jim English, as referenced in the Watershed Plan, so that these thoughts will be considered by your committee.
My thoughts and concerns go to the comments that Jim Simons made during the meeting and to your editorial in last week's Beachcomber.
In the last sentence of the third to the last paragraph of your editorial you stated If we continually diminish our water supply.... This to me implies that we are diminishing our water supply but I don't believe this to be the case. I agree with you on that. So far as I am aware, long term well data indicates that water levels in Vashon wells have remained about the same over a period of a couple of decades (if I remember correctly). That would indicate to me that we are not using water unsustainably. That does not mean, however, that we should not monitor our water supply and plan for what we would need to do if that information indicated our water supply were being diminished. I believe it is a good idea to plan ahead and have an action plan in place, just as we do with any other sort of emergency response plan. The editorial was referring to a proposal or principle that we use water sustainably. By definition, if water is not used sustainably, than water quality/quantity are diminishing (recognizing that for many uses, water quality is not different from water quantity in that polluted water that cannot be used has the same effect as a reduced water supply). In any case, the Plan's recommendation address what we should do to maintain a sustainable supply, or what we should do if we find that the water supply is not being used sustainably. Having these recommendations does not mean that we are currently using water unsustainably on Vashon. If water supply is stable, then none of the triggers in existing policy or recommended in the Watershed Plan to avoid a diminished water supply would need to be invoked.
During the meeting, Jim discussed the fact that there are, I believe, 19 wells that are being monitored and that data is being developed. He further indicated that our water supply has consistently stayed within a range that is acceptable. In answer to a question from Ed Palmer, Jim also indicated that we could get access to information on each of the wells that are being monitored on a website. And, that there is a geologic report on a website that provides an indication of the best data available as to where the water resources might be found. Am I correct so far? At the end of last week, I was browsing the

Comments Received After the Deadline**Commentor(s)**
(see list of
commentors at end
of document)

internet looking for the information that Jim said was there but I didn't find it. Can you provide me with information about where I should be looking? I'd like to see the geologic report and the information on the 19 wells. I will ask Jim Simmonds to ask to these questions.

As far as the data is concerned, why is it that it appears that the committee doesn't want to review data available from Larry Johnson? One of the committee members told another person in attendance on Wednesday evening that information that Larry had wouldn't be of any concern. I've also heard in the great Vashon rumor mill that the committee members know what Larry has to say and that they don't want to hear it. I know that Larry is rather opinionated; but, setting aside his opinions, I believe that his data of 30 or 35 years would compliment the data that you are developing. Data is data and should be reviewed and considered as such. I agree that we should use all of the data. I have never been party to any discussion of Larry's data, or any conversations that indicated people would not be open to reviewing and considering it. In any exercise, the quality and reliability of data has to be assessed, and I have no idea what sort of data Larry has and how rigorous it is. I have assumed that King County's program has made use of all of the available data. Jim, could you comment?

During the meeting, you indicated that District 19 had drilled 7 wells and that 5 were dry holes. Is this really accurate? I believe that the committee should take another look at the information if this information is considered as a part of the decision making. I have not checked with the District but my information was that they were all wells that were productive. However, they would not be productive in the volume that District 19 would require. It may be that my information is not correct and I would appreciate the committee looking into the real facts and providing this information to the community. This was Frank Jackson's statement at the meeting, and I was quoting him. I assumed that as a WD 19 Commission he had his facts straight. Perhaps we should bet a further clarification from WD 19.

Commentors:

- | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 Emma Amiad | 13 Biffle French | 25 Marcie Rubardt |
| 2 Jill Andrews | 14 Laurie Geissinger | 26 Merilee Runyan |
| 3 Martin Baker | 15 Joseph Hall Teresa Toole | 27 Murray Speirs |
| 4 Tom Bangasser | 16 Rayna Holtz | 28 Tom Terry |
| 5 Greg Beardsley | 17 Frank Jackson | 29 Mark Thorn, DVM |
| 6 Richard Bianchi | 18 Catherine Johnson | 30 Sue Trevathan |
| 7 Karen Biondo | 19 Donna Klemka | 31 March Twisdale |
| 8 Sapphire Blue | 20 Ann McMurdo | 32 Edith Ulatash |
| 9 Katie Bunnell / Del Langbauer | 21 Jane Neubauer | 33 Dennis Williams |
| 10 Robert Crawford | 22 Ed Palmer | 34 Janet Dennis Williams |
| 11 Cathy de Smet | 23 Bianca Perla | |
| 12 Scarlett Foster-Moss | 24 Barbara K. Roberts | |