

From: DeMond, Rosemary
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 7:27 AM
To: Patton, Brian <Brian.Patton@idwr.idaho.gov>; Weaver, Mathew <Mathew.Weaver@idwr.idaho.gov>
Cc: Baxter, Garrick <Garrick.Baxter@idwr.idaho.gov>; Spackman, Gary <Gary.Spackman@idwr.idaho.gov>
Subject: Fwd: my questions/thoughts on the comprehensive state water plan rules

From: Summer Bushnell
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 9:12 PM
Subject: my questions/thoughts on the comprehensive state water plan rules
To: DeMond, Rosemary

I was not able to attend the meeting in Coeur d'Alene tonight, so I am emailing you. 1) The rules on the comprehensive state water plan are from 1993, and while they say that they encourage the cooperation, participation and assistance of Dept. of Land, Parks n Rec, fish and game, health and welfare, transportation, federal agencies, local units of government, and affected Indian tribes - there is no mention of the protection of individuals/citizens water rights. I think that wording should be added that specifically individuals are interested parties in the comprehensive water plan. (page 5932) 2) Public hearings say that they should include all interested parties, does that include individual citizens or just agencies, government entities and tribes? I suggest that all interested parties be more defined and that public notice be given of hearing not just in the newspaper, but on the appropriate webpages, and social media accounts. (page 5932) 3) Why is the list of interim protected rivers from 1998, or 1993? Why are they interim for 25+ years? Either they need protecting or they don't. (page 5929) Sincerely, Summer Bushnell Post Falls, Idaho