

From: Ed Burns [<mailto:rpwa2003@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Thursday, April 28, 2016 11:53 AM
To: Mike Kaputa <Mike.Kaputa@CO.CHELAN.WA.US>
Subject: comments on IWG scoping

The main limitation I see with the plan is that conservation efforts seem to have the lowest priority. In the area where I live, which is served by COIC, there is no incentive to conserve since the water is basically free (\$80/yr/acre) and essentially nobody does conserve. The vast majority of usage appears to be lawn watering in an inefficient manner. At the height of last years snowpack drought people were not even making minimal efforts to conserve, e.g., they watering in the middle of 100 degree days, watering daily, over watering, etc. Lining the ditch won't have any effect on usage and the small amount saved will just be dumped in the Wenatchee. I don't see where the incentive for users to conserve will come from. Since it's a user-owned district the users are not going to vote to do something that will cost them money such as metering, or even agree to it if someone else pays costs of installing meters. I see nothing in the plan that will persuade them into giving up their lush green lawns in mid summer which, although ridiculous in an area which ranges from semi arid to outright desert, seem to be regarded as a god-given right (the irony is, if you drive to Seattle in the summer, the majority of people there let their lawns go dormant in mid summer). Why weren't the costs of a California-like scheme to pay people to go to xeriscaping considered? I also don't see how the pumping options help because it seems like it's a robbing Peter to pay Paul scheme where flow in the lower Icicle is increased whereas flow in the Wenatchee decreased.

From my observations it seems that the lack of conservation efforts are the norm in the area. I see the same watering behavior in Leavenworth and in the domestic users in the IPID as in COIC. The manager of IPID is quoted during last summer's drought: "Icicle users have been using record amounts of water.....We have been pushing the canal as hard a we can push it." He also claims that agricultural users irrigation efficiency is basically maxed out, but again, I saw sprinklers going in the middle of the day, and I'd wager that Israeli farmers are getting by with about half the water for the same crops. Although Leavenworth claims to have reduced per capita water usage, this was the result of a one-time (step function) decrease in usage when they installed meters, and it has not declined since then.

As far as environmental impact of individual projects: the remote control of output from the lakes would seem to be relatively innocuous; the rebuilding of the eightmile dam less so (interesting that in the reports the "historic" level of the lake is the level after the original dam was built); and the diversion from Upper Klonaqua lake, outrageous.

In summary, I think the plan proposes spending vast amounts of money on projects to provide water which serious conservation efforts, especially on the part of residential users, could largely provide.